

TRACTS
OF
THE ANGLICAN FATHERS.

DOCTRINAL.

VOL. II.

LONDON:
WILLIAM EDWARD PAINTER, STRAND.
1841.

CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION.

PART VI.—PREFACE.

The Right of the Church in a Christian State, and the Authority of the Church in Controversies of Faith (Thorndike)	1
---	---

PART VII.—PREFACE.

Justification by Faith (Tyndale)	57
The Nature of our Lord Jesus Christ's Death, and the Infinite Merit of his Sufferings (Bilson)	73

PART VIII.—PREFACE.

A Piteous Lamentation of the State of England (Ridley)	113
A Treatise on Image Worship (Ridley)	123
Absolution [the Castle of Comfort] (Becon)	133
Baptismal Regeneration (Bramhall)	153

PART IX.—PREFACE.

The Office and Character of Christ (Hooper)	169
The Old and the New Learning (Turner)	192

PART X.—PREFACE.

Election and Predestination (King)	225
------------------------------------	-----

PART XI.—PREFACE.

An Essay on Original Sin (Taylor)	267
Unwritten Tradition (Sandys)	289
Repentance (Kidder)	300

INTRODUCTION.

IN introducing the Second Volume of the Anglican Tracts to our readers—a volume, be it observed, devoted entirely to Doctrine—we shall not have to enlarge on the particular points which we have selected, for that has been done in the Prefaces to the separate Tracts, but shall endeavour to show the apostolic spirit in which those doctrines have been adopted and taught. The “text,” if we may use the expression, of our formularies, may be found in 1 Cor. iii. 11-15: “For other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ. Now upon this foundation if any man build, gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble, every man’s work shall be manifest, for the day shall declare it; because it shall be revealed by fire, and the fire shall try every man’s work of what sort it is. If any man’s work abide which he hath built thereon, he shall receive a reward. If any man’s work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss; yet he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire.” Now in showing how this “text” has been elucidated, both in the doctrines and discipline of our Church, we must first show how St. Paul applied them himself.

In a city like Corinth, it became him who wished to introduce the Gospel, while he withheld not one iota of its uncompromising purity, to depict it, nevertheless, in the most engaging colours; to dwell upon its encouragements, its promises, the liberty given unto us in Jesus; to strive ever to attract the hearts of the people, without shocking their prejudices; to amend their morals, without disheartening their endeavours. This was the

course pursued by St. Paul ; and we may observe throughout this epistle, his desire in things non-essential to leave them to their own discretion, while in things essential he exacted from them the most implicit obedience : he wished his Corinthian converts to be pure in their hearts, and correct in their doctrines ; but not ascetic in their practice, or uncharitable in their judgment of others. To this end he enjoined no rite, announced no doctrine, save such as were absolutely necessary to do, and to believe ; or if he did, it was with the acknowledgment that he did so upon his own responsibility, and however he might recommend, he did not command compliance. Well would it have been for Corinth had those who followed the apostle trod in his steps ; but far otherwise was the case, and, accordingly, we soon hear of dissent and schism : some said I am of Paul ; others, I of Apollos ; others, I of Cephas ; others, I of Christ. Wherein Apollos differed from Paul we know not ; but from various circumstances mentioned in the history, we gather that the subject of dispute between those who called themselves followers of Cephas, and those who took their denomination from Paul, was, as to the necessity of keeping the ceremonial law. Among the questions which the Apostle of the Gentiles thought it necessary to settle, circumcision was one. And although St. Peter grossly temporized on one occasion as to this matter, it is probable that his name was here used without his authority. One remarkable circumstance is, that some said, “ I am of Christ.” What, were not all of Christ ? Were there only a *few* Christians in a church founded by an apostle ? We find from the expostulatory question, “ Is Christ divided ? ” that the plea was no true one. They called themselves “ of Christ ” that they might manifest unchristian tempers, and professed subjection to the spiritual Head of the Church, only that, by this pretext, they might evade the authority of the apostles, and

dispense with obeying those whom the spiritual Head of the Church had appointed over them. It appears, then, that certain teachers, forgetting the situation of those to whom they preached, and the wise example of the inspired apostle, wished to impose on the Corinthian Church, as they had before tried in other cases, the yoke of the ceremonial law ; they wished these converts not only to worship in spirit and in truth, but likewise in such manner as *their* prejudices, *their* education preferred. This law might be binding upon a Jew, and the apostles seem to have observed it themselves ; though even on this point there is much doubt. St. Paul seems to have caused Timothy to receive circumcision rather to avoid scandal, than from any conviction of its necessity ; but in other cases, that is, among Gentiles, we find him boldly declaring that it was abrogated. It tended to encumber the Gospel with a tedious ritual, and was, therefore, unlikely to conduce to its success among the excitable and volatile Greeks. It enjoined painful rites and minute observances, and was, consequently, ill adapted for the most voluptuous and dissipated city in the world. Finally, it was in ill repute, universally despised, and therefore hardly adapted for reception in a place where the good opinion of this world was assiduously cultivated. Let us not, however, suppose, that the apostle wished to dress religion in the flowing robes of worldly conveniency—that he would allow sin or levity in the disciples of Christ. No ; he became, indeed, all things to all men ; but it was that he might catch some. He knew that there were many things good which were not necessary ; many things important that were not essential ; and he was unwilling to lose any by requiring too much. He knew that Naaman was pardoned, though he bowed in the house of Rimmon, because his heart was right with God ; and though the Gospel would allow of no such compliances as this, still he

knew that many were not only seeking for the spiritual Zion with their faces thitherward, but actually on their way; who were as yet babes in Christ, who could not yet perform all that was expected of a perfect Christian, much less all that the ingenuity of man has devised to render the Saviour's yoke heavy. To these Greek disciples, therefore, he preached Christian liberty, the abrogation of the ceremonial law, the unsatisfactory nature of earthly pleasures, the value of the Christian graces, and the glory of the resurrection. He justly condemned those who would make their own inferences as important as the Redeemer's words; their own observances as necessary as his commands. Here, then, do we see one of the evil results of false doctrine: there is no doubt that many who preached it sincerely believed it; yet it not only hindered their own usefulness, but impeded the work of others. It rendered the Gospel covenant distasteful; it brought upon themselves the reproof, and upon the Churches the displeasure, of the apostle; it caused strifes, and divisions, and heart-burnings; it induced the people to set up the authority of one apostle against another; it made their belief and their Church suspicious in the eyes of their heathen neighbours; it led the way to backslidings and open crimes; and had not St. Paul come to the aid of the Lord against the mighty spirit of heresy and schism, it would have overturned from its very foundations the whole Corinthian Church. In that management, which is necessary in every case, and which was particularly needful at Corinth, there is in the outset a great difficulty—one which, while it did not daunt the apostle in his undertaking, made him, nevertheless, very circumspect in the mode of its execution. He had to exhibit the Gospel by itself, divested, as far as possible, of rites, and forms, and ceremonies, aye, even of doctrines; he had to extract from these the Christianity, as a chemist extracts from the substances he treats, the subtle spirit:

this he had to exhibit as essential, and the rest as the vehicle in which this spirit was most conveniently received. Now the difficulty which we mention was this : if that while he declared that all Scripture was given by inspiration of God, and was profitable, he yet gave it to be understood, that there were in this inspired Scripture some hidden things which belonged to God, and some revealed which belonged to us and to our children ; that there were some things to be received by babes, and others only capable of being understood and practised by fathers in Christ ; that there were commands to persons in one situation, but not binding on those in another ; that, in short, there were things essential, things important, and things which, though useful, were neither essential nor very important : there was, we say, a danger, lest, in thus discriminating between the necessary, the expedient, and the lawful, he should seem to give up the reins to laxity of belief and corruption of manners. He had to show, therefore, that many a doctrine, if not essential to salvation, was yet highly important, hedging around by its sanctions, and preserving inviolate by its effects, those more awful truths upon which our final well-being depend ; that many another, though not so weighty as these, yet tending to cultivate a right spirit and charitable conduct, was eminently useful ; and that of all those which were declared by the divine authority to be true, there was not one which we ought not humbly to believe, and sincerely to reduce to practice.

The great foundation—that is, the doctrine of Christ's atonement—upon which the Christian temple arises in all its fair proportions ; the foundation which is this corner-stone, elect, precious, is the only one permitted. Of those who build on other foundations, St. Paul says nothing ; but the tenor of Scripture assures us, that of whatsoever materials their buildings are composed, however graceful their design, and however elaborate

their superstructure, yet when the rains descend, and the floods come, and the winds blow, and beat upon that house, it shall fall, and great shall be the fall of it. But of those who do build on the true foundation, it is not every one who builds in faith; there are those who, though they do use gold, silver, precious stones—whose doctrines are indeed scriptural, and their knowledge extensive—but they have no living faith, the cement that should hold together the parts of their work is wanting; and though the materials be good, and the foundation sound, it shall not prove any shelter for them in the day of trial. There are, again, those who build with wood, hay, and stubble, and who are equally devoid of faith: these take for doctrines the commandments of men; they draw upon their own imaginations, instead of on the oracles of God; instead of reading with prayer and humility, they do it with the self-sufficiency of philosophy. These are the students who first frame a system of belief, and then consult the Scriptures to extract proofs for it—who first decide what doctrines God *should* promulge, and then sit down to prove that those are the doctrines he *has* declared, and this the scheme according to which he does govern.

Again, there are those who receive this foundation as the groundwork of their faith; but because they are spiritually dead, they will have such doctrines as will flatter their own state, they will speak unto themselves smooth things and prophecy deceits. Upon the foreknowledge of God will they found the corruptions of Antinomianism; upon his long-suffering will they build the flattering idea that he is altogether such an one as themselves; that he is too merciful to be severe; that the denunciations of his wrath are to be understood in a figurative sense; and that even the unrepenting sinner may look upon him rather as a father than as a judge. Here we have instanced three descriptions of persons, all of whom do, in one sense,

build upon a right foundation, viz., as far as doctrinal truth is concerned ; yet these are not the men of whom St. Paul says, “that they shall be saved, yet though as by fire ;” they are rather among those *unlearned* and *unskilful* who *wrest the Scripture* to their own destruction ; and when the fire shall try their work, it shall be burned, and they themselves shall perish.

The people who *are* to be saved, *though as by fire*, are such as, having obtained remission of sins through the blood of Christ, yet entertain erroneous views of Christian truth in other particulars—men who have sincerely sought for truth, but who, from strong prejudice, or too credulous a spirit, have never apprehended it. Not those who reject any part of God’s word, because they cannot reconcile it with the rest, or because it is too severe for the lives they lead, and which they are resolved to continue ; but who are really sincere, and yet humble in their error. Of such we are told, that “every man’s work shall be manifest, for the day that cometh shall declare it ; because it shall be revealed by fire, and the fire shall try every man’s work of what sort it is : if any man’s work abide which he hath built thereon, he shall receive a reward : if any man’s work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss, yet he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire.” If such as these, then—men who have taken hold on the hope set before them, and who, though erroneous, have been single-minded—are to be saved only as by fire, how great must be the importance of truth in matters of religion. Every true doctrine tends to strengthen the believer in holy things ; to comfort him when faint, to encourage him when tempted : and every error deprives him of some support, of some consolation, of some happy assistance, in his way towards Zion. Man must live by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God ; and if, however unintentionally, he throws away any part of this spiritual nutriment, he can never hope to attain to the

fulness of the stature of a man in Christ Jesus. If he mix this bread of heaven with the base product of earth, it will but retard his growth in grace; and the only way of becoming fathers in the Church, is to desire earnestly, as babes in Christ, the sincere milk of the word, by which we are nourished to salvation.

A man may pass the gulf between earth and heaven on a single plank, if that plank be the doctrine of the atonement. It is true, that if he reject the rest of God's truth, he will have but little to keep him from falling even from this; even from the nature of things, such a case must be very rare—scarcely probable; but it is, we have the authority of St. Paul for believing, just possible. While, therefore, we do not take upon ourselves to condemn such persons, we cannot but look upon them as pursuing a very perilous course; it is highly probable that they are deceiving their own hearts, and that the root of the matter is not in them: even if it be, they are always in great danger of falling from their hopes; and if they are saved at all, it will be *so as by fire*.

C.

CAMBRIDGE,

The Feast of St. John Evan.

CHAPTER I.

THE AUTHORITY OF THE CHURCH IN CONTROVERSIES.

SECTION 1. *Thorndike on the Right of the Church in a
Christian State.*

SECTION 2. *Thorndike on Church Authority.*

PREFACE.

IN calling the attention of the reader to the following Tracts of the learned and accomplished Thorndike, it will be necessary for us to enter at some length on the reasons which have decided us in taking this step. The first volume of the Anglican Tracts was confined to the Office and Authority of the Church generally, and the only particular to which its contents were directed was the compilation and composition of the Liturgy.

It was necessary to commence a series in this way, because the *first* thing which the Churchman has to prove is, that the body to which he attaches himself is Scriptural in its character; and this can only be done by an attentive examination of its authorized forms, and a close investigation of the circumstances under which those forms were drawn up. The Anglican Church at all times not only permitted but enjoined her members to search the Scriptures, and to test, moreover, by that unerring standard, *her* formularies.

But in order that this should be done, it was essential not only that the Scriptures should be studied by the aid of catholic antiquity, that heresy might be avoided through errors in private judgment, but also that the writings of the framers of the Liturgy should be studied, in order that errors might be avoided in point of historical truth. The man who writes so much and so laboriously, as did most of the Anglican Reformers, is hardly likely to leave any important point, either of doctrine or discipline, untouched; and by the comparison, therefore, of such passages, can the *true* meaning of the Church formularies be most easily ascertained.

The most interesting as well as the most awful part of the authority with which the Church is invested, is clearly that con-

nected with the sacraments ; and the first volume was, therefore, devoted to the showing what opinions were held by the chief Reformers on that topic. It pointed out, in addition, the nature of the union between the Church and State, so much talked of, but, alas ! so little understood, in the present day.

But when this had been done, it remained to show that the Church was Scriptural in her doctrines, and also what those doctrines were ; that she was Apostolic in her discipline, and what that discipline was ; that she was Evangelical in her practice, and also what manner of life she enjoined her members to lead. Such are the subjects of enquiry which are incumbent upon *all men* to pursue ; for we are creatures of God before we are members of Christ.

We have said that “the Church has enjoined her sons to search the Scriptures, and to test, moreover, by that unerring standard, *her* formularies ;” and it will be more than expedient, before we enter on the study of such a writer as Thorndike, to spend a little time in examining this proposition, and to see how far it differs from the “implicit faith” of the Roman Church on the one hand, and from the private interpretation of modern Dissenters on the other.

This *via media*, however little understood by the mass, and even by many of the learned among our brethren of the Church, is, nevertheless, very perceptible in the spirit of her institutions. It is but an application of the soundest principle—a principle never objected to but by mystics, viz., that reason is but a means to an end. Christianity comes to us *upon evidence*, and we are to examine that evidence and sift it, and the more minutely we do so the better ; for we are reasoning beings before we are religious beings. We can believe only what we understand, and so far as we understand it, notwithstanding all that mystics may tell us to the contrary. We know well that there are, and are for the wisest of purposes, mysteries in religion ; but a mystery is a revealed *fact*, the cause or manner of which is hidden. There is no mystery in the simple proposition that the three persons in the ever-blessed Trinity are *one God* : this is a revealed fact which we clearly understand, and, indeed, *cannot*

misunderstand. The mystery is, *how* can this be, and as to the *manner* of the Divine existence ; we *believe nothing*, because we *know* or *understand* nothing.

The more closely we examine the evidences of Christianity, the more clearly will it be established in our minds ; it is established in the minds of even young children, by an operation of what may be called “the pure intelligence,” which intuitively perceives and appreciates truth, and which is the highest and noblest of the mental powers, if, indeed, it be not something still higher—the spark, viz., of the divine nature, which even the fall did not *wholly* extinguish.

Thus, then, by Reason, whether we know it or not, do we attain to a belief in the truth of Christianity—the *credence*, not the *faith*, in the divine mission of the Saviour ; but when this step is attained, Reason has resigned her sovereignty, and now acts only as a handmaid : she may aid us in developing that which is intricate, and enlightening that which is obscure, but she has no longer the power to reject that which she finds the Scriptures to declare. Now this is exactly the principle which the Church adopts with respect to her own authority : she expressly *disclaims* the right of imposing anything which may not be proved by direct warrant of Holy Scripture, as necessary for belief, and *claims*, at the same time, authority in *controversies* of faith. “Examine, then, scrupulously (does she say to her members) my claim to your allegiance ; but when you have decided the validity of that claim, do not put your private interpretation in the place of my authority.” Just so far does she admit, and just so far does she deny, “the right of private judgment.” She does not claim to be the only branch of Christ’s Church Catholic, nor does she threaten her members with excommunication, if they, *being laics*, do not accord with *all* her propositions ; but she does require from her clergy, and that by good right, a full and hearty consent to *all* that she has promulgated, and to both clergy and laity does she declare, “If you teach or preach anything in contradiction to my doctrines, you are no longer members of my communion.” In this it would be difficult to detect any arrogant assumption of power, or tyran-

nous use of it. Now, as to the *nature* and *value* of church membership, we do not here intend to enlarge; this will be done in the third volume, when we treat upon *discipline*. Our object in the present one is an exposition of the *doctrines* taught by the Anglican Church, and we have thought it expedient to commence this part of our undertaking by two Tracts by Thorndike. Herbert Thorndike, one of the most learned defenders that ever the Church boasted, was in his own day looked upon as a great authority; and it would certainly be difficult to find a controversialist of more acute intellect, or who more thoroughly understood the subjects upon which he wrote. Yet while a traditional deference has been paid to his *name*, his *works* are comparatively little known. For this, two reasons may be assigned, the first and principal of which is their extreme rarity. His treatise on the Right of the Church in a Christian State, is so uncommon that we only know of three copies in existence: one of these, by the kind courtesy of the Rev. Dr. Vivian, the present President of Sion College, we have been permitted to use, and from it the first Tract of the present part is reprinted. His "Epilogue of the Tragedy of the Church" is also among the "*libri rarissimi*" of modern times: this also we have obtained through the same channel, and have taken from it the second Tract in this part. But another reason why these works are so little known, and why, indeed, they have never been reprinted as a whole, is their peculiarity of style.

Clear as are the arguments of Thorndike, no man perhaps ever made them so unattractive by the absence of all elegance. Nor is this by any means the greatest of his faults as a writer; so involved, and so intricate, and at the same time so long are his sentences, that they require the most laborious attention; and he who would well and satisfactorily understand them, must often be contented to go over them more than once or twice.

The catalogue of faults does not, moreover, stop here. The pages of Thorndike are full of digressions, and these leading continually to other digressions. It would appear that, confiding in his controversial powers, he loved difficulties for the sake of overcoming them, and no sooner caught sight of any knotty

question which arose from his main subject, than he forthwith forsook that main subject, nor did he return to it till he had successfully grappled with the new obstacle. It may, then, fairly be asked, why make choice of such a writer, and that, too, in a series of Tracts meant for extensive circulation? To this we have three replies. First, that extracts from Thorndike's works have for many months past been promised, and we felt bound to fulfil that promise. Secondly, because the arguments used by this eminent man are almost as novel as his style is unpleasant. Thirdly, because what we have reprinted is admirably adapted to our purpose, as introducing a volume of doctrinal Tracts; for while he touches so largely upon discipline, as to make the present part almost equally fit to introduce the *third* as the second volume, he yet speaks of the right of the Church to decide in controversies of faith, and does this in a mode equally unexpected and convincing.

We had at first some idea of throwing the arguments of Thorndike into our own language, so as to make them intelligible with less labour to the reader; but against this there lay the obvious objection, that the Tracts would no longer be capable of quotation as Thorndike's: and as our object is to influence the great controversies of the day, by bringing continually before the controversialists of all parties the sentiments of the reformers, as authorized by the Church, we at once saw the necessity of renouncing our first plan. The reader has, therefore, all the crabbedness and intricacy, as well as all the learning and logic, of this justly celebrated writer. Again, it was suggested, that by making extracts, sometimes large and sometimes small, and then connecting them into a whole, we might avoid the tedious and continual digressions to which our author is so painfully given; and here, too, a similar objection decided us to adopt our present plan. We should, by the expedient suggested, have indeed preserved the very words of Thorndike, and avoided his digressions; but however faithfully we had kept to our author's meaning, we should have been always liable to the *charge* of having perverted it—of having garbled his statements, and taken just what suited our own pur-

poses, while we allowed the rest to remain unknown. This, too, was the more probable, as certain Romanists, in endeavouring to show that Anglo-Catholic writers condemn the principles of their own Church, have actually garbled, in a very late publication, the statements of Thorndike and some others.

Those who are themselves guilty of malpractices are not only the most likely to suspect others of similar conduct, but also to charge them with it when they know the charge to be false. The reader is now in possession of the motives which induced us not to meddle with the text of the Tracts which we here present to him. He has them with all their deformities of style, and all their varieties of digression; but he has them also with all the profundity of their argument, and all the richness of their erudition. They are well worth reading, and reading again, even were their defects increased tenfold.

C.

THE RIGHT OF THE CHURCH IN A CHRISTIAN STATE.

The Church hath no temporal power, but stands, by God's privilege, of holding assemblies. The ground of the secular powers' interest in Church matters. The power of the keys, what it is ; and that it cannot be taken from the Church. That the whole bodies of Christians, contained in several cities and the territories of them, make several Churches, depending upon the Churches of greater cities : therefore, the people are not endowed with the chief power in any Church.

It is visible to all understandings that there are two states of God's Church ; for there must needs be a great difference between the Church, as it was first established by the ordinances of the Apostles, before the exercise of Christianity was allowed and privileged by the laws of the Roman empire, and as it now standeth, protected by the laws of the Christian kingdoms and commonwealths. And my purpose is here to debate, what power the Church ought to have in this latter state, and what right accrues to secular powers in Church matters, when they profess Christianity and the maintenance of it : which one dispute will necessarily conclude the chief matters now in compromise, concerning the state of the Church in this kingdom. To understand this aright, we must suppose that the Church is not endowed with any manner of the secular power of this world, and the civil societies of it, which constraineth men to obedience by force : for it will be easy for ordinary understandings, after the miserable disputes which this civil war have advanced, to perceive, that though there be many points of that right wherein sovereign power consisteth, yet all of them are resolved into the power of the sword ; seeing that there is no manner of public act, either of sovereign power or any derived from it, that could be effectual, as the use of civil society requires, did not all men's senses tell them that there is force ready to reduce the refractory to obedience. Now, that our Saviour did, and was to disclaim all title to the sword, is manifest by the Gospel, and the possession of it ; for, being suspected in his lifetime by his enemies, and lastly accused by

Pilate, as one who sought to usurp it, his renouncing it so publicly, because it clears him, therefore convinces the injustice of the sentence against him. And, truly, what entertainment shall we imagine his Gospel would have found in the world, had it pretended to establish itself by force? For this profession must needs have produced that effect which Mahometism did afterwards; to wit, the subversion of all States which it might prove able to jostle with, and to prevail. But Christianity being first initiated by the cross of Christ, and professing nothing but to follow him in bearing his cross, it is manifest, that those which saw not reason to believe it, must be convinced that they ought not to persecute it. For if it preserve the power of the sword in those hands wherein it is found when the Gospel is preached and received anywhere, then, of necessity, all rights, all goods of this world, in the possession whereof the power of the sword professes to maintain all subjects, are, by the Gospel, maintained in those hands that have them by just title of human right: and so that which I here suppose, is no more than the received position of divines, “that temporal dominion is not founded in grace;” for men’s rights, powers, and privileges in civil societies are no less their own, and concern their estate no less, than their goods and possessions. Therefore, though much more evidence might be brought to prove this, from the Apostles, commanding Christians to obey secular powers, children their parents, slaves their masters, wives their husbands, and the like, according to the laws, but *above* the laws, for conscience to God, obliging thereby all states to maintain Christianity; yet, this being a point which no party professes to stick at, I will hereupon presume to take it for granted.

But though the Church is not endowed with any coactive power by divine right, yet, by divine right, and by patent from God, it is endowed with a power of holding assemblies for the common service of God, *before* any grant of the powers of the world, and *against* any interdict of them, if so it falls out. For the communion which the Gospel establisheth among Christians, is not only invisible in the heart, believing the same faith, and disposed to live according to it; but also outwardly visible, not only in the profession of the same faith, which may be common to those that communicate in nothing else, but also in the common service of God: for, seeing God hath given his Church the ordinances of his worship, wherewith he requireth to be served in common by his Church—some of them common both to the Church and the Synagogue, that is, to Jews and Christians; others delivered by the Gospel

only to the Church—it is manifest that the Church is privileged by God, because commanded, to join in serving him according to those ordinances. And, therefore, we are not to ask an express warrant in Scripture for this, whether duty or privilege; because it was always in force among the people of God, though not always free from the bondage of strangers. The Apostle truly, writing to the Hebrews not to fall away from Christianity to Judaism, for the persecutions which the Jews, their natives, brought upon them (which he that will diligently observe, shall find to be the full scope of that epistle), inferreth, as a consequence (Heb. x. 25), not to forsake the assembling of themselves: shewing that Christianity cannot be professed without so doing, though it bring persecution with it; as we know the primitive Christians frequented the service of God, when they were in danger of the laws; because that which the laws forbad was their assemblies. Wherefore, as within several commonwealths there are particular societies, colleges, and corporations, subsisting by grant of their sovereigns; and as, by the law of nations, there is a kind of society and commonwealth among those that are bound in the same vessel, upon the same voyage, which Aristotle calls *συμπλοϊαν*, as there is also among them that travel together in the caravans of the East, because they submit to some rule in regard of some common interest; so must we understand the Church to be a human, though not a civil, society, corporation, or commonwealth. Not as these last-named, which consist of subjects to several states, warranted and protected by the law of nations; nor as the former, by charter from some sovereigns; but by that law of God whereby all nations are called to serve him, by those ordinances which he has established in the Church. Therefore, the main point of that charter, which makes the Church such a society or commonwealth, is the right of assembling, and holding such assemblies, *without* warrant, *against* all law of the world that forbids it. The particulars of it are those rights which God hath given his Church, to preserve unity and communion in the celebration of those ordinances for which it assembleth. For, since the principles of Christianity profess one Church, and that the unity thereof extendeth to this visible communion, it is manifest hereby that the will of God is, that all Christians communicate with all Christians, in all ordinances of his service, when occasion requires; a thing which the practice of all sides confesses. For though this communion be interrupted with so many schisms, yet, since all parties labour to shew that the cause of separation is not on their side, they acknow-

ledge all separation to be against God's ordinance, when they labour to clear themselves of the blame of it.

In the next place, we are to enquire, upon what title of right the Church is ingrafted into civil societies and sovereignties, by virtue whereof secular powers exercise that right to which they pretend in Church matters?—for I perceive those of the congregations oftentimes demand, what ground we have in Scripture for National Churches. Now, the term of National Churches, it seems, is something improper; because, as one and the same nation may be divided into several sovereignties, and the Churches thereof, by consequence, subject to several sovereigns, so may the same sovereignty contain several nations, and the Churches of them; which in these cases are not properly National Churches, and yet are properly that which is signified by the term of National Churches. But, setting aside this exception, I conceive those of the congregations have reason to make the demand, and that the answer to it, if once well made, will be of consequence to settle many things in debate: for that the same right, in matters of religion, is due to Christian princes and states, which the Kings of Judah practised under the Law, of itself no way appears, because of the general difference between the Law and the Gospel. To which may be added, to tie the knot faster, that there is this clear difference between them, in the particular in hand—that the Law was confined to one people, as being the condition of that covenant whereby God undertook to give them the land of promise, and to maintain them in the free and happy possession of it; they undertaking, on their part, to serve him, and rule themselves by it. But the Gospel is the new covenant, by which God undertakes to give life everlasting to those that take up Christ's cross, to perform it: the persons, therefore, of whom the Church consists, being of all nations, all of them are of equal interest in that wherein they communicate, and therefore in the rules; by which it is manifest that no sovereign can have more interest than another in creating that right, by virtue whereof the subjects of several sovereignties communicate; otherwise, the unity of the Church must needs suffer, one sovereign prescribing that as necessary to the communion of the Church in his dominions, which the sovereigns over other parts of the Church, perhaps, allow not. But though, as a divine, I admit this debate, yet, as a Christian and a divine both, I condemn the separation which they have made, before it be decided. The Church of England giveth to the king that power in Church matters, which the kings of God's ancient

people, and Christian emperors after them, always practised. This possession was enough to have kept unity, though the reason appeared not, *why* Christian princes should have the same right in the Church as the kings of Judah had in the Synagogue; for, if they observe it well, this right is no where established upon the kings of God's ancient people, by way of precept, in the Law; for seeing the Law commanded them not to have a king, but gave them leave to have a king when they would, upon such terms as it requireth (Deut. xvii. 14), it cannot be said that any right in matters of religion is settled upon the king by that Law, which never provided that there should be a king. The question is, then, not whether the kings of Judah had power in matters of religion, which is express in Scripture; but upon what title they had it, which is not to be had but by interpretation of the Law. And this we shall find, if we consider that the Law was given to that people when they were freed from bondage, and invested in the sovereign power of themselves, (*a*) as to a body politic, such as they became, by submitting to it. So that, though many precepts thereof concern the conscience of particular persons, yet there are also many that take hold of the *community* of the people; for which, particular persons cannot be answerable, further than the rate of that power by which they act in it; as the destroying of malefactors, idolators in particular. These precepts, then, being given to the community of the people, and the common power of the people falling to the king, constituted according to the Law aforesaid, it followeth, that being invested with the power, he stands thereby countable for the laws to be enforced by it: and then the question that remains will be no more but this—whether civil societies, and the sovereign powers of them, are called to be Christian, *as such*, and not only as *particular persons*; a thing which Tertullian seems to have doubted of, when he made an *if* of it, Apologet, cap. xxi., “Si possent esse, &c., Cæsares Christiani,”—if Emperors could be Christians; and Origen, when he expounds the words of Moses, “I will provoke them to jealousy, by a people which are not a people” (so he reads it), of the Christians, whereof there were some of all nations, and no whole nation professed Christianity (in x. ad. Rom. lib. viii., and in Psal. xxxvi. Hom. i.) seems to count this estate and condition essential to the Church. But, since Anabaptists are no more Anabaptists, in denying the power of the sword to be consistent with Christianity, it seems there is no question left about this, as, indeed, there ought to be none; for the prophecies, which went before, of the calling of the Gentiles to Christianity, were not fulfilled till the Roman empire professed to

maintain it: and thereby the will of God being fulfilled, it is manifest that the will of God is, that civil societies, and the power of them, should maintain Christianity by their swords, and the acts to which it enableth; but always with that difference from the Synagogue which has been expressed: for, if the Church subsists in several sovereignties, the power which each of them can have in Church matters must needs be concluded by that power which God hath ordained in his Church, the determining whereof shall become necessary to preserve the unity of it.

Thus much premised, the first point we are to debate is, whether excommunication be a secular punishment, amounting to outlawry, or banishment, as Erastus would have it; or the chief act of ecclesiastical power, the power of the spiritual sword of the Church cutting from the visible communion thereof such as are lawfully presumed to be cut off from the invisible by sin. For, if there be a visible society of the Church founded by God, without dependence from man, there must be in it a visible power to determine who shall be or not be members of it; which, by consequence, is the sovereign power in the society of the Church, as the power of the sword is in visible societies. But excommunication in the Synagogue was a temporal punishment, such as I said; and, therefore, it is argued that our Lord meant not of that when he said, "Tell it to the Church," that term, in the Old Testament, being used for the congregation of God's people in the quality of a civil society; and, therefore, when he addeth, "Let him be unto thee as a heathen or a publican," they say it is manifest that neither ethnicks nor publicans were excommunicated out of the Synagogue, nor the excommunicate excluded from the service of God in the Temple or Synagogue. And when our Lord addeth, "Whatsoever ye bind and loose on earth," it is manifest, say they, in the language of the Jews, used among the Talmud doctors, that "bound and loose" is nothing else but that which is declared to be bound or loose, that is, prohibited and permitted; and, therefore, the effects of the keys of the Church, which is binding and loosing, reaches no further than declaring what was lawful and what unlawful (as to the Jews by the law of Moses), in point of conscience. The first argument that I make against this opinion, is drawn from the power of baptizing, thereby understanding, not the *office of ministering*, but the *right of granting, that sacrament*; which we, in this state of the Church, do not distinguish, because all are born within the pale of the Church, and, by order thereof, baptized (while) infants; but may see a necessary ground so to distinguish, by St. Paul, when he denies "that he was sent to baptize, but to preach

the Gospel" (1 Cor. i, 17). Whereas, the words of our Lord in the Gospel are manifest, where he chargeth his Apostles "to preach and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost." For the baptizing of all that should turn Christians could not be personally commanded the Apostles, but to preach to all nations, and make disciples out of all nations: this they might do to those that might be baptized by such as they should appoint. We must note that it is, in the original, *μαθητεύετε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη*, "make disciples," as the Syriac truly translates it: commanding, first, to bring men to be disciples, then to baptize. Now, disciples are those that were after called Christians; such we profess ourselves (Acts xi. 26); those of whom our Lord saith, in the Gospel, that "those that will do his Father's will were his disciples." Wherefore they are commanded to baptize such as should submit to the Gospel; and so, to judge whether each man did so or not, they that were trusted with the Gospel, were, by consequence, trusted to judge. The effect of this trust is seen in the many orders and canons of the primitive Church, by which those that desired to be admitted into the Church, by baptism, are limited to the trial of several years, to examine their profession, whether sincere or not; and such as gained their living by such trades as Christianity allowed not, rejected until they renounced them. Not that my intent is to say that these canons were limited by the Apostles; but because it is an argument, that always to *judge* who shall be admitted to baptism, and who not, is another manner of power than to *baptize*, being the power of them that were able to settle such canons. Though it is plain, by the Scriptures, that those rules had their beginning from the Apostles themselves: for, when St. Peter saith (1 Peter, iii. 21), that "the baptism which saveth us is not the laying down the filth of the flesh, but the examination of a good conscience to God," *ἀγαθῆς συνειδήσεως ἐπερώτημα*, he sheweth that the interrogatories which the ancient Church used to propound to them that were to be baptized, were then in use, and established by the Apostles, as the condition of a contract between the Church and them, obliging themselves to live, according to the Gospel, as disciples. And the Apostle (Heb. vi. 2), speaking of "the foundation of repentance from dead works, the doctrine of baptisms, and imposition of hands," manifestly shews the succeeding custom of the Church, that they which sued for baptism should be catechised in the doctrines of the Gospel, and contract with the Church to forsake such courses of the world as stood not with it, to be brought in by the Apostles. This is it which is here called the doctrine of baptisms in the plural number; not for that frantic reason which

the distemper of this time hath brought forth; because there are two baptisms—one of John, by water; another of Christ, by the Spirit; but because it was severally taught several persons before they were admitted to their several baptisms; and, therefore, called also the doctrine of imposition of hands: because we understand, by Clemens Alexandrinus, *Pædag.* iii. 2, and by the Apostolical constitutions, vii. 40, that, when they came to the Church to be catechised, and were catechised, they were then dismissed, by him that catechised them, with imposition of hands, that is, with prayer for them, that they might, in due time, become good Christians; all visible marks of the power of the Church in judging whether a man were fit for baptism or not. To which I will add only that of Eusebius, *De vitâ Constant.* iv.; where, speaking of the baptism of Constantine, he saith, *ἐξομολογημένος της διὰ χειροθεσίας ἐνχῶν ἤξιετο*, that, confessing his sins, he was admitted to prayer, with imposition of hands. If it be said that there were added to the Church three thousand a day (*Acts* ii. 41), which could not thus be catechised, my answer is, that two cases were always excepted from the rule: the first was, in danger of death; the second, when, by eagerness of those that desired baptism, the hand of God appeared extraordinary in the work of their conversion to Christianity. Besides, it is not said that they were baptized that day, but that they were added to the Church that day; which is true, though they only professed themselves disciples for the present, passing, nevertheless, their examination and instruction, as the case required. If, therefore, there be a power settled in the Church, by God, to judge who is fit to be admitted into it, then is the same power enabled to refuse him that shall appear unfit; then, by the same reason, to exclude him that proves himself unfit after he is admitted.

This is the next argument, which I will ground upon the discipline of penance, as it was anciently practised in the Church; which is opened by the observation, that those who, contrary to this contract with the Church, fell into sins destructive to Christianity, were fain to sue to be admitted to penance: which supposeth, that till they had given satisfaction of their sincerity in Christianity, they remained strangers to the communion of the Church. For it appeareth, by the most ancient of Church writers, that for divers ages, the greatest sinners, as apostates, murderers, and adulterers, were wholly excluded from penance. For though Tertullian was a Montanist, when he cried out upon Zephyrinus, Bishop of Rome, for admitting adulterers to penance, in his book "*De Pudicitâ*," yet it is manifest, by his case, that it had formerly been refused in the Church, because the granting of it makes him a Montanist; (*b*) and St. Cyprian (*Epist.* ad Anto-

nianum) testifieth, that divers African bishops afore him had refused it, maintaining communion, nevertheless, with those that granted it. Irenæus, also (i. 9), saith of a certain woman, that had been seduced and defiled by Marcus, the heretic, that, after she was brought to the sight of her sin by some Christians, she spent all her days in bewailing it. This was, therefore, without recovering the communion of the Church again. And he that shall but look upon the canons of the Eliberitane Council, shall easily see many kinds of sins censured, some of them not to be admitted to communion till the point, others not at the point, of death. In this case, and in this estate, those only who are excluded from being admitted to penance, were properly excommunicate: neither could those that were admitted to penance be absolutely counted so, because, in danger of death, they were to receive the communion; though, in case they recovered, they stood bound to complete their penance. And from hence afterwards, also, those that had once been admitted to penance, if they fell into the like sins again, were not to be admitted to penance the second time (Concil. Tolet. x.; Can. xi.; Eliber. Can. iii. & vii.; Ambros. de Pœnit. ii. 10, 11.; Junoc. i.; Ep. i.; August. Epist. l. & liv.) It is an easy thing to say that this rigour was an infirmity in the Church of those times, not understanding aright free justification by faith: but as it is manifest that this rigour of discipline abated more and more, age by age, till that now it is come to nothing; so, if we go upwards, and compare the writings of the Apostles with the original practice of the Church, it will appear that the rigour of it was brought in by them, because it abated, by degrees, from age to age, till at length it is almost quite lost;—that the reformation of the Church consists in retaining it;—that we shall do so much prejudice to Christianity, as we shall, by undue interpretation, make justification by faith inconsistent with it: and, in fine, it will appear that all penance presupposeth excommunication, being only some abatement of it. “There is a sin unto death (saith the Apostle, 1 John, v. 16); I say not that ye pray for it.” This is commonly understood of denying God’s truth against that light which convinceth the conscience; which, if it were true, the Apostle’s precept could never come into practice, seeing no man can know, unless by revelation, against what light his neighbour sinneth. But the Novatians, at the Council of Nice—as Socrates and Soromenus both report (Eccles. Hist. i. 7. i. 233), answering Constantine, that they refused penance only to those that sinned the sin unto death—do give us to understand, that St. John was understood,

by the Church, not to command that apostates be admitted to penance. And so also Tertullian, in many places of his book "De Pudicit." as cap. xiv., argueth from this place, that penance was not to be granted to adulterers: which sheweth that the Church understood the place in the same sense, though it admitted not his consequence. So also Origen, in Matt. xviii. 18, tract vii. I was long doubtful of the truth of this interpretation, because the Apostle, premising "If any man see his brother sin a sin not unto death, let him ask of God," seems to speak of private prayers of particular persons. But the words of St. James v., 16, have cleared me of this doubt: "Confess your sins one to another," saith he, "and pray for one another, that ye may be healed;" in which words, I make no doubt but he speaketh of public penance; for having premised that the Presbyters be sent for to the sick, that they confess their sins to the Presbyters, that they pray for them, anointing them with oil, that their sins may be forgiven them—to shew, nevertheless, that, according to the custom aforesaid, in case they recovered, they were to stand bound to penance—he addeth, "Confess your sins to one another;" to signify that this confession and penance remained due before the Church, as we understand, by the twelfth canon of Nice, that the practice was so long afterwards. And this is proved by the precept of both Apostles, to pray for one another; for it is manifest, that there were two means to obtain remission of sins in this case—the humiliation which the Church prescribed and the penitent performed, and the prayers of the Church; which St. John prescribeth not to be granted to apostates.

The very same is the meaning of the Apostle to the Hebrews, vi., 6, when he pronounceth it "impossible that those that fall away, be renewed again to repentance;" for as they that stood for baptism, when they were catechised in Christianity, were properly said *ἐγκατατίθενται εἰς μετάνοιαν*, to be instructed or dedicated to repentance, because of the repentance from dead works which they professed; so they that forfeited their Christianity, by violating the contract of baptism, are no less properly said *ἀνακατατίθενται εἰς μετάνοιαν*, to be renewed, instructed, and dedicated again to repentance. And the Apostle's reason agrees; for "because the earth that receives rain, and renders no fruit, is near the curse," therefore the Church will not easily believe that such an one shall lightly obtain of God the grace to become a sincere Christian: and, therefore, the Apostle says not that it is impossible that such an one should repent, but that he should be instructed again to repentance, to wit, by the Church; as the Novatians

answered Constantine, that they remitted such persons to God, not prejudicing their salvation, but not admitting them to the means of reconciliation by the Church. And herewith agreeth the example of Esau, used by the Apostle again (xii. 17) saying that “he found not place of repentance,” alluding to that room in the Church where penitents were placed apart by themselves. And again (x. 26), the allusion which he maketh to the custom under the Law, understood by the Hebrews to whom he writeth, consisteth in this—that as there was no sacrifice to be made for apostates, though for ethnicks (for this was the use of the law, as we understood by Moses Maimoni, in the title of “Dressing Oblations,” cap iii., num. 3, 5), so the Christian sacrifice of the prayers of the Church was not to be offered for those that had renounced Christianity. If it be thus, you will ask, what was the fault of the Novatians, seeing they understood this text right? And my answer is, that, nevertheless, they are heretics; extending the name of heretics to those whom we now call schismatics, as it is often used: for St. John, as he commands not, so he forbids not, that they be admitted to penance. The other Apostle tells them it is impossible, to let them know that they must not expect it; but neither says that the Church could not give it. When, therefore, the Church, to preserve unity, was necessitated to grant it, as we see by St. Cyprian, the Novatians were no less schismatics, in making separation upon the quarrel (though, perhaps, the reason be not urged by their adversaries), than if they had understood the text amiss; the unity of the Church being of more moment than much understanding in the Scriptures (*c*). And so, perhaps, St. Paul’s words will belong to this purpose (1 Tim. v. 19); as not only the Socinians of late, but Pacianus among the ancients, Paron ad Pœnitentiam and Matthæus Galenus among modern writers, do expound them: to wit, that when he saith—“Lay hands suddenly on no man, nor partake of other men’s sins,” he leaves it to Timothy’s judgment whom to admit, whom not to admit, to penance; because his blessing, with imposition of hands, was not the mark of absolution, but of admission to penance, as well as the ceremony of ordinations. And though this text of the Apostle be understood, in particular, of ordinations, yet, by the same reason which he allegeth, it is to be extended to all acts of the Church, that are blessed by the prayers of the Church, with imposition of hands: for if Timothy, by imposing hands upon those whom he ordains, becomes accessory to their sins, if they be unfit to be ordained; by the same reason, if he impose hands, that is, grants penance unto them that are not fit for it, he becomes accessory to the sins which they commit by being admitted to it; imposition of hands being

nothing else but a ceremony of that benediction, which signifieth, that those acts to which it is granted are allowed and authorised by the public power of the Church. So, imposition of hands, in confirmation, is the admission of him that is confirmed to the communion of the visible Church; in penance, the restoring of him; in ordination, to the exercise of this or that function in the Church. Prayer over the sick, which the Apostle commands (James v. 14), and our Lord, in the Gospel, made with imposition of hands, signified the admitting of the sick to penance. And it is said, that in some Eastern Churches, to this day, marriages are blessed with imposition of hands, in signification that the Church alloweth of them; which, as it was always the right of the Church to do, as I shall observe in another place, so it appeareth so to be, in that marriage was never celebrated, among Christians, without the prayers of the Church. And this observation I insist upon the more cheerfully, because it much strengtheneth the argument which the Church maketh for the baptism of infants, from the act of our Saviour, in the Gospel, when he blessed the infants with imposition of hands: for, if all imposition of hands be an act of the public power of the Church, allowing that which is done with it, then can this imposition of hands signify no less, than that those to whom our Lord granteth it, belong to his kingdom of the visible Church. One little objection there lies against this, from the incestuous person at Corinth, whom St. Paul, in his second epistle, seems to re-admit to communion, his crime being as deep as adultery, which we say the rigour of apostolical discipline admitted not to penance.

To which, I have divers things to answer. That this cannot be objected, but by him that acknowledges that he was excommunicate by the former epistle. That Tertullian, in his book "*De Pudicitia*," disputes at large, that it is not the same case which is spoken of in both epistles. That the crime here specified, perhaps, is not of the number of those which, from the beginning, were excluded from penance. But waiving all this, as I noticed two cases in which men were baptized without regular trial, so, supposing the rule to take hold in this case, it is no inconvenience to grant that St. Paul might waive the rigour of discipline, so settled, as supposing there might be cause to waive it. If this opinion seems new, my purpose requires but these two points—that the penance practised by the ancient Church supposed excommunication, which it only abateth; and that it was instituted by the Apostles;—and for that there is enough said, I suppose, even to them that believe not, that the Apostles excluded any kind of crimes from penance. Besides that of

St. Paul, blaming the Corinthians that they were puffed up, and had not rather lamented, that he that had done the evil might be put from among them (1 Cor. v. 2). And again, fearing that, when he returned, he should be forced to lament many (2 Cor. xii. 21). Which, if we compare with the primitive solemnity of excommunication, which, by the constitutions of the Apostles (ii. 16), and other ways, we understand, was to put the persons out of the Church doors with mourning; it will appear, that Epiphanius is in the right in expounding this latter text to this purpose (*Hær. lix. num. 5*). The power of excommunication, then, by all this, is no more than the necessary consequence of the power of admitting to communion by baptism; which, if it imply a contract with the Church to live according to the rule of Christianity, then it is forfeit to him that evidently does that which cannot stand with that rule, and the Church not tied to restore it, but as the person can give satisfaction to observe it for the future.

Now, I will make short work with Erastus, his long labour, to prove that there is no excommunication commanded by the Law. I yield it, and make a consequence which will be thought a strange one; but I have it from the speculation of Origen, in *Levit., Hom. xi.*, and others, why the Church should only be enabled to excommunicate, whereas the Synagogue was enabled to put to death. From the observation of St. Augustine, *Quæst. in Deuteronomy v. 38, de Fide and Operibus, cap. vi.*, and others, it appears that excommunication in the Church is the same with the power of life and death in the Synagogue. My argument is, then, that the Church is to have the power of excommunication, because the Synagogue had the power of life and death; and the reason of the consequence this: because, as the Law, being the condition of the covenant by which the benefit of the commonwealth of Israel was due, enabled to put to death such as destroyed it; so the Gospel, being the condition of the covenant that makes men desirous of the spiritual Jerusalem, must enable to put them from society thereof that forfeited it. It is not my intent hereby to say that there was no excommunication under the Law. For I do believe that we have mention of it in *Ezra x., 8*, grounded, if I mistake not, upon the commission of the King of Persia, recorded *Ezra vii. 26*; for that which is here called "rooting out," seems to be the same that is called, in the other place, "dividing from the synagogue of the captives;" being, indeed, a kind of temporal outlawry, to which is joined confiscation of goods. For so saith Luther, truly, that the greater excommunication among Christians is every where a temporal punishment; to wit, in regard of some

temporal punishment attending it, in Christian states, which, in Christianity, is accidental by act of those states—in Judaism, essential, so long as those temporal advantages, which were the essential condition of the Law, were not forfeited. And this, without doubt, is the same punishment which the Gospels call “putting out of the Synagogue.”—though I cannot say so peremptory for the temporal effects of it—which several sovereigns could easily limit to several terms. For the right that Ezra might have to introduce this penalty, is clear by the law of Deut. xvii., 12, which, enabling to put them to death that obeyed not the Synagogue, enabled to excommunicate, to banish, to outlaw them, much more. But, as we see the Romans allowed them not the power of life and death, which the Persians granted them; so I am not to grant, that putting out of the Synagogue of the Gospel, implieth the extinguishing of the civil being of any Jew. The Talmud doctors say, that those that were under the greater excommunication were to dwell in a cottage alone, and to have meat and drink brought them, till they died (*Arba Turim*, or *Shulchan Auroh*, in “*Fore Dea Hilcoth Niddui Voherem*”): a speculation suitable to their condition in their dispersions, which no man is bound to believe how far it was in force and practice. But suppose the Synagogue in the same condition with the Church afore Constantine, enjoying no privilege, but to serve God according to the Law, as the Church according to the Gospel. And then, as the Synagogue must always have power to excommunicate, which had power to put to death; so, I say, is she enabled by our Lord to do what I have shewed the Apostles did do, by Matt. xviii., 18. I yield that the terms of binding and loosing are used by the Jews, to signify the declaring of what is prohibited and permitted by the Law; but I yield not that it can be so understood here, because the ground of this declaration ceaseth under the Gospel, being derived from the six hundred and thirteen precepts of the Law, and from the power of the priests and doctors to determine all cases which the Law had not determined, in dependence upon the great consistory at Jerusalem, by the law of Deut. xvii. 12; which precepts and which power being voided by the Gospel, can any man think that the power of binding and loosing, here given the Church, is to be understood of it? Besides, it is, in the promise made to St. Peter (Mat. xvi. 19), said expressly to be the act of the power of the keys. And what is that? Is it not an expression manifestly borrowed from that which is said to Eliakim son of Hilkiah (Es. xxii. 23,) “I will give thee the keys of the house of David:” whereupon, our Lord (Apoc. iii. 7,) is said to have

the key of David, that is, of the house of David? Whereby the Apostles under our Lord are made stewards of the Church, as Eliakim of the court, to admit and exclude whom he pleased. And so it is manifest, that the power of the keys given St. Peter (Mat. xvi. 19), as the Church (Mat. xviii., 18), is that power which you have seen practised under the Apostles, of admitting to, and excluding from, the Church, by baptism and penance. So St. Cyprian expressly understandeth the power of the keys to consist in baptising (Ep. lxxiii). And of penance, that which followeth is an express argument, as I have observed, p. 129 of that short discourse; for having said, "Whatsoever ye bind," he addeth immediately, "Again I say to you, that if two of you agree to ask anything, it shall be done you by my Father in heaven." For the means of pardon being the humiliation of the penitent, enjoined by the Church, and joined with the prayers thereof, as hath been said, the consequence of our Saviour's discourse—first, of informing the Church; then, of binding and loosing; lastly, of granting the prayers of the Church—shews that he speaks of those prayers which should be made in behalf of such as were bound, for not hearing the Church. And hereby we see how binding and loosing of sins is attributed to the keys of the Church, which is made a visible society, by the power of holding assemblies, to which no man is to be admitted, till there be just presumption that he is of the Heavenly Jerusalem that is above. As the power of judging who is, and who is not, thus qualified, presupposes a profession; so an instruction, obliging the obedience of them which seek remission of sins by the Gospel, therefore confidently assures it to them which conform themselves. In a word, because admitting to, and excluding from, the Church, is, or ought to be, a just and lawful presumption of admitting to, or excluding from, Heaven, it is morally and legally the same act that entitleth to Heaven, and to the Church, that maketh an heir of life everlasting and a Christian; because he that obeyeth the Church, *in submitting to the Gospel*, is as certainly a member of the invisible as of the visible Church. Herewith agree the words of our Lord—"Let him be unto thee as a heathen and a publican;" not as if heathens could be excommunicate the Synagogue who never were of it, or as if the Jews then durst excommunicate publicans that levied taxes for the Romans; but because, by their usage of publicans and Gentiles, it was proper for our Lord to signify how he would have Christians to use the excommunicate; there being no reason why he can be thought, by these words, to regulate the conversation of the Jews in that estate, so long

as the Law stood, but to give his Church rules to last to the world's end. The Jews then abhorred the company, not only of idolators, to testify how much they abhorred idols, and to maintain the people in detestation of them (by ceremonies brought in by the guides of the Synagogue for that purpose), but all those that conversed with idolators. For this cause, we see they murmur against our Lord for eating with publicans; they wash when they come from market, where commonly they conversed with Gentiles, and, which is strange, such as Cornelius was, being allowed to dwell among them by the Law, professing one God, and taking upon them the precepts of the sons of Noe; yet are the converted Jews scandalized at St. Peter, for eating with Cornelius (Acts xi. 2). These rules are made void by the Gospel; for St. Paul tells the Corinthians expressly, that they are not to forbear the company of Gentiles, for those sins which their profession imported; but if a Christian live in any of those heathen vices with him, they are not so much as to eat (1 Cor. v. 2); to wit, as it followeth immediately, being condemned by the Church upon such a cause: "For," saith he, "what have I to do to judge them that are without? do not ye judge those that are within? But those that are without God judgeth: and ye shall take the evil man from among you." That is, are not you, by the power you have of judging those that are within, to take away him that hath done evil, leaving to God to judge those without? Here the case is plain, there is power in the Church to judge and take away offenders. Of which power the Apostle speaks (Tit. iii. 9), when he says, that "Hereticks are condemned of themselves;" if we follow St. Hierome's exposition, which seems unquestionable. For experience convinces, that most hereticks think themselves in the right; so far they are from condemning themselves in their consciences: but they condemn themselves by cutting off themselves from the Church, which other sinners are condemned to *by* the Church. Neither is it anything else than excommunication which the Apostle signifieth by "delivering to Satan" (1 Cor. v. 6) saving that he expresseth an extraordinary effect that followed it in the Apostle's time; to wit, that those which were put out of the Church became visibly subject to Satan, inflicting plagues and diseases on their bodies, which might reduce them to repentance; which the Apostle calleth the "destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus:" as he saith of Hymenæus and Philetus (1 Tim. i. 21), "Whom I have delivered to Satan, that they may learn not to blaspheme." For it is not to be doubted that the Apostles had power, like that which St. Peter exercised on

Ananias and Sapphira, thus to punish those that opposed them; as St. Paul divers times intimates in the texts which I have quoted in another place; provided by God, as the rest of miraculous graces, to evidence his presence in the Church. These particulars, which I huddle up together by the way, might have been drawn out into several arguments; but I content myself with the consequence, by which the patent of this power in the Gospel is cleared, upon which patent all the power of the Church is grounded: that is, if Christians are only to abstain from eating with excommunicate persons, as Jews did with the publicans and Gentiles, then excommunication is to be understood, when our Lord saith, "Let him be to thee as a heathen and a publican." As for that which is said, that the excommunicate among the Jews were not excluded either Temple or Synagogue, therefore it was a secular punishment, it is a mistake. That which the Jews call *ררי* was not excommunication, no more than that which the constitutions of the Apostles call *ἀφορισμός*, which is the same, being but a step to it, like that which is now commonly called the lesser excommunication; and, therefore, he that was under this censure among the Jews, was but in part removed from the communion, as well of sacred as civil society;—for it hath been shewed, very learnedly, in the "Book of the Power of the Keys," that he stood as much removed from one as from the other, because that, as well in the Synagogue as at home, no man was to come within his four cubits. But when the Talmud doctors determine that the excommunicate dwell in a cottage apart, and have sustenance brought him, such an one was past coming into the Temple or Synagogue. And so, I suppose, was he that was put out of the Synagogue, for acknowledging our Lord Christ to be a true prophet (John ix. 35): for they which afterwards were wont to curse all his followers in their Synagogues, as Justin Martyr (*Dial cum Tryph.*) and Epiphanius, (*Hær. xxx.*), tell us that they did in their time, are not like to endure in their society, whether sacred or civil, him that, in their interpretation, was fallen from Moses. And thus is the power of the keys clearly grounded upon this charter of the Gospel, and all the right of the Church upon it.

Only one objection yet remains, which, to me, hath always seemed very difficult; for it is manifest that our Lord speaketh here of matters of interest between party and party, when he saith, "If thy brother offend thee:" and it may justly seem strange that our Lord should give the Church power to excommunicate those that will not stand to the sentence of the Church in such matters. But so it is. The Jews, in their dispersion, were fain to have recourse to this penalty, to enforce the juris-

though it hath great right in ecclesiastical matters ; of which in diction of their own bodies, lest, if causes should be carried thence before heathen courts, God's name should be blasphemed, and the Gentiles scandalized, at his people saying, " See what peace and right there is among those that profess the true God ! " For the same causes, our Lord here estateth the same power upon the Church ; whereof I cannot give a more sufficient and effectual argument, than by shewing that it was in use under the Apostles ; though the place out of which I shall shew this, is, hitherto, otherwise understood ; because men consider not that it is *not* against Christianity that there be several seats, for several ranks and dignities of the world, in the Church ; and, therefore, that it is not *that* which the Apostle finds fault with (James ii. 1), when he forbids them " to have the faith of God with respect of persons." But the Synagogue, which he speaketh of in the next words, is to be understood of the court, where they judged the causes and differences between members of the Church. For that the Jews were wont to keep court in their Synagogues, we learn, not only by the Talmud doctor, Maimoni by name, in the " Title of Oaths," cap. ix., where he speaketh particularly of the case of an oath made in the Synagogue, when the court sat there, but by that which we find in the New Testament (Mat. x. 17, xxiii. 34 ; Mark xiii. 9 ; Acts xxii. 19, xxvi. 11) ; as well as in Epiphanius, Hær. xxx., that they used to scourge in their Synagogues ; to wit, where sentence was given, there justice was executed. Wherefore, being converted to Christianity, they held the same course, as appears by the words of the Apostle that follow : " Do ye not make a difference among yourselves, and are become judges of evil thoughts ? " And again : " If ye accept persons ye commit sin, being reprov'd by the law." By what law, but by that which saith, " Thou shalt not accept persons in judgment ? " (Lev. xix. 15) ; for the execution of which law, it is expressly provided, by the Jews' constitutions, in Maimoni Sanedrinca, xxi., that when a poor man and a rich plead together, the rich shall not be bid to sit down, and the poor stand or sit in a worse place, but both sit, or both stand ; which, you see, is the particular for which the Apostle charges them " to have the faith of Christ with respect of persons ; " that is, to shew favour in the causes of Christians, according to their persons. The same course, we may well presume, was settled by the Apostles, at Corinth, by the blame St. Paul charged them with, for going to law before infidels (1 Cor. vi. 1, 2) ; for how should he blame them for doing that which they had *not* order before not to do ? And, therefore, if our Lord, in this place, gives the Church power to excommunicate those that stand not to the sentence of the Church, much

deposited by the Apostles, and what persons are trusted with it ; more those that violate the Christianity which they have professed. And this is also here expressed, when from the particular he goes to the general, saying, “ Whatsoever ye bind on earth ; ” giving, thereby, the same power to the Church there which he gave to St. Peter, (Mat. xvi. 19), and to the Apostles (John xx. 22) ; and so we have here two heads of the causes of excommunication : the first, of such things as concern the conscience and salvation of particular Christians, when they commit such sins as destroy Christianity ; the second, of such as concern the community of the Church, and the unity thereof, in which, not the *act*, but the *contumacy*—*the not hearing of the Church*—makes them subject to their sentence.

It is not my purpose to say that these nice reasons are to be the title upon which the right of the Church to this power standeth or falleth ; but, that being in possession of it, upon a title as old as Christianity, and demonstrable by the same evidence, it cannot be ejected out of this possession by anything in the Scripture, when it is rightly understood. One objection there is more, in consequence to this last reason, that if the Church have power to sentence civil causes of Christians, and, by excommunication, to enforce that sentence, when states profess Christianity, all civil laws will cease, and all judicatories be resolved into one consistory of the Church. The answer to this I defer, till I come to shew the right of the states that profess Christianity in Church matters, where it will easily appear how this inconvenience ceaseth. In the mean time, the sovereign power of the Church consisting in the sword of excommunication, upon which the society thereof is founded, it is necessarily manifest that this power is not lost to the Church, nor forfeited to the state that professes Christianity, and undertakes the protection of the Church ; for the Church and civil societies must needs remain distinct bodies when the Church is ingrafted into the state, and the same Christians members of both, in regard of the relations, rights, and obligations, which, in the same persons, remain distinct, according to the distinct societies and qualities of several persons in the same : therefore, as I said in the beginning, that no Christian, *as a Christian*, can challenge any temporal right by his Christianity, which the state, wherein he is called to be a Christian, giveth him not ; so, on the other side, no man, by his rank in any state, is invested with any power proceeding from the foundation of the Church, *as it is the Church* : so that which is true in the parts, holds in the whole. The Church is endowed with no temporal right ; therefore the State is endowed with no ecclesiastical right,

due time: for all this right supposeth the Church already established by that power on which it standeth, and so must maintain it upon the same terms which it findeth. The homage which the Church payeth to God, for the protection of the State, is not to betray the right, founded on the express charter of God, to powers subsisting by the works of his mediate Providence; (*d*) but to subdue subjects to that obedience, for *conscience*, which the State exacteth *by force*. For there is, necessarily, this difference between the principles upon which the Church and civil communities subsist: the charter of the one is revealed by grace—the others stand upon the laws of nature and nations, and acts, which Providence enables men to do, agreeable to the same; therefore, as no state stands by the Gospel, so no right, settled by the Gospel, can belong to any state, or person, as a member of any state. Besides, kingdoms and states have their several bounds. Many sovereignties are contained in Christendom; whereas, the Church is, by God's ordinance, one visible society of all Christians. Now, it is manifest, first, that there are some things which equally concern the whole Church, and all parts of it; secondly, that in all things which concern the whole Church, no part thereof, in any state or kingdom, can be concluded by that state or kingdom. Again, the Apostle's rule is (1 Cor. vii. 24), that every man abide in the state wherein he is called to be a Christian; and this proves that no Christian can challenge any temporal right by his Christianity; because states subsist before they are Christian. Therefore, it proves also that no state, or member of it, is, by being such, endowed with any right grounded on the constitution of the Church; and, therefore, seeing the Church subsisted three hundred years before any state professed Christianity, whatsoever rights it used, during that time, manifestly, it ought, therefore, still to use and enjoy; this being the most pertinent evidence to shew the bounds of it. In particular, as to the power of the keys and excommunication, the act of it, seeing the intent of it, is to admit into the visible society of the Church, upon presumption that, by the right use of it, sin is taken away, and the person admitted to the invisible society of life everlasting; and seeing no commonwealth, no quality in any, pretendeth to take away sin, or to judge in whom it is taken away, it followeth that no man whatsoever, by virtue of any rank in any state, is qualified to manage this power, or can presume so to do.

Having seen, thus far, upon what patent the community of the Church is established, and the power thereof founded, it will be necessary farther to dispute, in what hands this power is

which point, before it be voided, we can neither determine what form of government God hath ordained in his Church, nor how it may be exercised in Christian states, without crossing the right which they challenge in Church matters. The Presbyterians having designed several Presbyteries for the government of several congregations that assemble together for the service of God, and having cried up this design for the throne of Christ, the new Jerusalem, and the kingdom of God, seeing there is no question made, that where there is a Presbytery there is a Church, and where there is a Church there is the power of the keys which God hath endowed his Church with, seem to have given those of the congregations occasion to interpose that every congregation, that assembles for the common service of God, is, by consequence, to have the power of the keys to excommunicate : whereunto adding another principle, that the chief power of every congregation is in the people, it follows that they are all absolute, without dependence on the rest of the Church. But, all this while, both run away with a presumption, for which they can shew us never a title or syllable of evidence in all the Scriptures. For Presbyters and Presbyteries they may shew us in the Scriptures, and no grand mercy, unless they can shew us how to understand them better then they do ; but that every congregation, that assembles together to serve God in command, should have a company of Presbyters for the government of it, is a thing so contrary to all the intelligence we have concerning the state of the Church, either under the Apostles themselves, by the Scriptures, or any primitive records of the Church, or in the succeeding ages of the Church, that they must demand of all men to renounce common sense, and all *historical* as well as divine truth, before they can believe it. Whereas, by the same evidence by which the rest of Christianity is conveyed and commended unto us, that is, by the Scriptures, interpreted by the original and universal practice of the Church, it will appear that the Apostles, planting Christianity, not only in those cities where they preached most, because there the harvest was greatest, but in the countries adjoining, which, by the custom of all civil nations, everywhere resort to their cities for justice, designed the several bodies of Christians that should be found abiding in several cities, and the territories of the same, to make several Churches; the government whereof they planted in those cities, both for themselves and the countries that resorted unto them. And as, in the civil government of all civil people, particular cities depend upon mother cities, heads of provinces, governments, or sovereignties, so the Churches of particular cities depend upon the Churches of those mother cities, that, by the union and correspon-

dence of those Churches, drawing along with them all the Churches under them, the unity of the whole Church, consisting of them all, might be established and entertained. This is the effect of that observation which may be advanced from the Acts of the Apostles, that whereas it is said (Acts xiv. 23), that "Paul and Barnabas ordained Presbyters in every Church." St. Paul saith, that "he left Titus in Crete, to ordain Presbyters in every city" (Tit. i. 5). And again (Acts xvi. 4), "As they passed by the cities, they delivered unto them the decrees determined by the Apostles and Presbyters at Jerusalem:" the cities of which he had said before, that "they ordained Presbyters in every Church" planted in those cities, as Titus in every city. So nice as this evidence may seem to those that consider not the state of the whole Church, when it shall appear to any man, as, to all that consider with their eyes open, it must appear, that always all congregations of Christians, remaining in the country adjoining to any city, made one Church with the Christians of that city; common sense will enforce that the Apostle's design was the model from which this form was copied out in all parts of the Church.

To which purpose we are to consider, in the next place, an excellent observation that pious and learned prelate, the Lord Primate of Ireland, published, in a little discourse of the original of bishops, upon the seven Churches of Asia, to which St. John is commanded to direct that epistle, contained in the second and third chapters of the Apocalypse. The observation consists of this—that the seven cities, wherein those seven churches are said to be, were seven chief cities, or mother cities, of the province of Asia; whereby it is manifest that the chief Churches, upon which inferior Churches were to depend, were planted in the chief mother cities, to which the countries about them resorted for justice. For, certainly, no man will offer such violence to his own common sense, as to say that there were, at the time of writing this epistle, but seven congregations of Christians in that province, where St. Paul first, and after him St. John, had taken such pains. And if more congregations, but only seven Churches, for what reason, but because many congregations make but one Church, when they are under the city in which that Church is planted? There hath been, indeed, an objection made from the words of this epistle, when it is said, at the end of the address to every particular Church, "He that hath ears to hear let him hear what the Spirit saith to the Churches." The address beginning always thus—"To the Church of Ephesus, thus saith the Spirit; to the Church Smyrna, thus saith the Spirit;" and so of the rest. The objection pretendeth, that by these words it appears that there were, in Ephesus, for example, many Churches,

constituting the Presbytery of that city, which is there called the Church of Ephesus. For if this were so, I would acknowledge that this argument were overthrown, and that Churches were not convertible with cities; but that many Churches are here called the Church of Ephesus, because the seat of the Presbytery was at Ephesus, according to the Presbyterian design. But this objection both carries with it an answer to discover the mistake upon which it is grounded, and draws after it an effectual argument to choke the opinion which it supports. For is not St. John expressly commanded (Apoc. i. 2), to “write and send one letter to all those seven Churches?” And can any man be so senseless as, when it is said, “what the Spirit saith to the Churches,” to understand several Churches of Ephesus, Smyrna, and the rest, and not the seven Churches to which the one letter is directed? And, therefore, the argument stands good, that in these seven cities there were but seven Churches; and that the letter is directed to these mother Churches planted in the mother cities, because inferior cities, receiving their Christianity from them, were to depend upon them for the regulating of all things concerning the exercise of it: as the original and universal condition and state of the Church convinces.

Now the argument which this objection and the answer draws after it, is this, that in all the New Testament you shall never find any mention of several Churches in any city, as Rome, Ephesus, Antiochia, Jerusalem. But when there is speech of any province, be it never so small, you shall find mention of a plural number of Churches in it. For of the Churches of Asia, Syria, Cilicia, Macedonia, Achaia, Galatia, Judea, and Samaria, and of the Hebrews in their dispersions, we find express mention upon several occasions (Acts ix. 31, viii. 5, 40, xv. 41; 1 Cor. xvi. 1; 2 Cor. viii. 2; 1 Thes. ii. 14; Apoc. i. 2, ii. 7, 11, 17, 29, iii. 6, 13, 22.) Though Samaria, among the rest, were a province of no great extent, yet, for example, you have, in that province, the city whereof Simon Magnus was, called Gittha, saith Epiphanius, Hær. xxi., now a village, but in those days a city, saith he (of which Acts viii. 5, “And Philip went down to a city of Samaria,” not *the city*, as we translate it); and Cæsarea, which Joseph shews us was in that province (xxi. 7.) Now, tell me what reason can be given for this by any man that will pretend to understand either Scripture, or any record of learning, but that Churches are convertible with cities? For had there been many Churches within the city of Ephesus, for example, of parallel power and privilege, making up one class, or Presbytery, or whatsoever new name can be given a new thing, without the least syllable of example from

the Apostles to Calvin, must not these have been called the Churches, not the Church, of Ephesus?

I come now to a very express mark of this dependence, during the time, and in the actions, of the Apostles; and, therefore, by their order, acknowledged, not only by themselves, but by all employed by them, in the planting of the Churches. And it is the going of Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem, in behalf of the Churches of Syria and Cilicia, troubled by some that taught at Antiochia, from whence those Churches received their Christianity, that Christians are to keep the law of Moses (Acts xiii. 1, xv. 1); for were not Paul and Barnabas able to resolve this question at Antiochia, Paul especially protesting "that he received not the doctrine of the Gospel which he preached from man, or by man" (Gal. i. 1), who is constrained, both to the Galatians and elsewhere, to oppose his calling as a bulwark against all that laboured to bring Judaism into the Church; surely, in regard of the thing, they were; but, in regard of authority to the Church, they were not. Barnabas was employed by the Apostles to visit Antiochia; he found Christians there, but made them a *Church*, by ordering their assemblies (Acts xi. 20, 24, 25, 26); and he it was who first brought Saul into that service, by his authority from the Apostles; though, afterwards, both of them were extraordinarily employed, by the Holy Ghost, to preach the Gospel and plant Churches (Acts xiii. 1). All this while, the Church could not look upon Saul in the quality and rank of the twelve Apostles, which afterwards he shews us was acknowledged by the Twelve themselves, at Jerusalem (Gal. ii. 8, 9), to wit, when he went to Jerusalem with Barnabas about this question (Acts xv. 1); for I can see no reason to doubt that all that he speaks of there passed during the time of this journey. And, in the mean time, it was easy for those that stood for the Law, to pretend revelation from God, and authority from the Apostles, in matter of Christianity, as well as Paul and Barnabas. What possible way was there, then, to end this difference, but that of the Apostle (1 Cor. xiv. 32, 33), "The spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets; for God is not the God of unquietness, but of peace; as in all Churches of the saints." Whereupon, vindicating his authority, and challenging obedience to his order, even from prophets which might be lifted up with revelations to oppose, he addeth, "Came the word of God from you, or came it to you alone? If any man think himself a prophet, or spiritual, let him acknowledge the things that I write to you to be the commandments of God." That is, that Apostles, being trusted to convey the Gospel to the world, were to be obeyed, even by prophets

themselves, as the last resolution of the Church, in the will of God, granting his revelations with that temper, that, as one prophet might see more, in the sense, effect, and consequence of revelations granted to another, than himself could do, in which regard the spirits of the prophets were to be subject to the prophets; so, for the public order of the Church, all were to have recourse to the Apostles, whom he had trusted with it. If, then, the Church of Antiochia, in which were many prophets, and among them such as Paul and Barnabas, endowed with the immediate revelations of the Holy Ghost (Acts xiii. 1), must resort to Jerusalem, the seat of the Apostles, to be resolved in matters concerning the state of the Church; how much more are we to believe that God hath ordained that dependence of Churches, without which the unity of no other human society can be preserved, when he governeth them not, but by human discretion of reasonable persons? Besides, we are here to take notice that the Church of Antiochia being once resolved, the Churches of Syria and Cilicia are resolved by the same decree (Acts. xvi. 4); because, being planted from thence, they were to depend upon it for the rule and practice of Christianity. Therefore it is both truly and pertinently observed, that the decree made at Jerusalem was local, and not universal; which, had it been made for the whole Church, there could not have been that controversy which we find was at Corinth, by St. Paul (1 Cor. viii. 1), about eating things offered to idols. Neither could the Apostle give leave to the Corinthians to eat them materially, as God's creatures, not formally, as things offered to idols, as he does (1 Cor. viii. 7), had the body of the Apostles at Jerusalem absolutely forbid the eating of them to Gentile Christians, for avoiding the scandal of Jewish Christians. But, because the decree concerned only the Church of Antiochia, and so, by consequence, the Churches depending upon it, therefore, among those that depended not upon it, for whom the rule was not intended, it was not to be in force.

There is yet one reason behind, which is the ground of all, from the original constitution of the Synagogue. Moses, by the advice of Jethro, ordained the captains of thousands, hundreds, fifties, and tens, to judge the causes of the people under himself, (Exod. xviii. 24, 25). To himself, God joined afterwards (lxx.) persons for his assistance (Num. xi. 16): but these captains were to be in place but during the pilgrimage of the wilderness; for when they came to be settled in the land of promise, the Law provideth, that "Judges and ministers be ordained in every city" (Deut. xvi. 18,) who, if there fell any difference about the Law, were to repair to

Jerusalem, to the successors of Moses and his consistory, for resolution in it (Deut. xvii. 12) ; by which Law, wheresoever the ark should be, this consistory was to sit as inferior consistories, in all inferior cities. Most men will marvel what this is to my purpose, because most men have a prejudice, that the power of the Church is to be derived from the rights and privileges of the priests and Levites during the Law, though there be no reason for it ; for these rights and privileges were not only temporary, to vanish when the Gospel was published, but also, while the Law stood, but local and personal, not extending, beyond the temple or land of promise, over any but their own tribe. But it is very well known, that, from the time of the Greekish empire, and partly before it, Judaism subsisted in all parts wheresoever the Jews were dispersed ; and that, wheresoever it subsisted, there were the people to be governed and regulated in the observation of the Law, and the public worship of God, according to the same, they dwelt, also, all over the land of promise, whereas the temple stood but in one place. It is also manifest that this Law, which gave the consistory power of life and death, to preserve the body of that people in unity, and to prevent schisms upon different interpretations of the Law, was found requisite to be put in practice in their dispersions ; to wit, as to the determining of all differences arising out of the Law, not as to the power of life and death to enforce such sentences ; this power being seldom granted them by their sovereigns : for at Alexandria, we understand, from Philo, in his book “*De Legatione ad Caium*,” that there was such a consistory, as also in Babylonia there was the like, as the Jews’ writings tell us ; for the little chronicle, which they call “*Seder Olam Zuta*,” gives us the names of the heads thereof for many ages. And after the destruction of the temple, it is manifest, not only by *their* writings, as *Semach David*, *Sepher Juchasin*, and the like, but by Epiphanius, in the “*Heresy of the Ebionites*,” and the constitutions of the Emperors remaining in the codes, “*Tit. de Judæis*” and “*Cælicolis*,” that there continued a consistory at Tiberias for many ages ; the heads whereof were of the family of David, as Epiphanius, agreeing with the Jews, informeth us, in the place aforementioned. And as, by the story of Saul, in the Acts, it appears that the Jews of Damascus were subject to the government at Jerusalem ; so, by Epiphanius, in the “*Heresy of the Ebionites*,” it appears, that the Synagogues of Syria and Cilicia were subject to the consistory at Tiberias ; that the Synagogues of the parts of Assyria and Media were to that in Bagdat ; and, without doubt, that great body of Jews,

dispersed through Egypt, was to that at Alexandria. As for the law of Deut. xvii. 18, the Jews need not tell us, as they do, Maimoni by name, “Tit. de Synedrio,” that they were not bound to observe that in their dispersions; for how could there be consistories for the Jews in all cities all over the world? But this they tell us, withal—in particular, Arba Thurim, in the same title, *sub init*—that thereby they hold themselves bound to erect consistories in the chief cities of their dispersions. In this condition, what is the difference between the state of the Synagogue and the Church, setting aside that essential difference between the Law and the Gospel, by which Judaism was confined to one nation, but Christianity had a promise to be received by the Gentiles? By reason whereof the Law ceased, as it was proper to the Jews, and Christians became obliged only to the perpetual law of God, besides a very few positive precepts of our Lord—as of baptism, and the eucharist, and the power of the keys; by virtue whereof, and by the general commission of the Apostles, all ordinances, whereby they should regulate the society of the Church, were to be received as the commandments of God. Here is the reason for which it is probable that the Apostles, in designing the government of the Church, should follow no other pattern than that which they saw in use by the Law in the Synagogue. For the design in both being to maintain the law of God, and the unity of his people in his service, saving the difference between them, what form should they follow but that which the Law had taught their forefathers? But when the effect hereof appears, in the first lines of this model, traced by the Apostles, and filled up by their successors, it is manifest that these laws were the pattern, but the order of the Apostles the act which put it in being and force. The Churches of Jerusalem, Antiochia, Rome, and Alexandria, no man can deny, were planted by the Apostles in person, and by their deputies. That they became afterwards heads of the Churches that lay about them, is no more than that which the consistories planted at Jerusalem or Tiberias, and in the chief cities of the Jews’ dispersions, were to the Synagogues underneath them, by virtue of the Law. This is, therefore, the original of the dependence of Churches upon the greatest mother Churches: and, therefore, it is no marvel, that Jerusalem, once the mother city of Christianity, became afterwards the seat of a patriarch indeed, in remembrance of that privilege, but inferior in dignity, and nothing comparable in bounds, to the rest, because it was none of the greatest and most capital cities; the rule of the Apostles’ design being this, that the greatest cities should be the seats of the greatest Churches. And that Con-

stantinople, when it came afterwards to be a seat of the empire, was put in the next place to the chief, as it was no act of the Apostles, so it is an argument of the rule by which the rest had been ordered for the same reason. As for the other law of Deut. xvi. 18, I know not what could be more agreeable to it, than that the rule of the ancient Church, which is to be seen, not only in those few ancient canons alleged in the discourse of the primitive government of Churches (p. 67), but in innumerable passages of Church writers, that cathedral churches and cities be convertible; that is, both of the same extent. Thus the epistle of Ignatius to the Romans is inscribed, *τῇ τεκκλησίᾳ θεῶν, τῇ προκαθήμενῃ ἐν τῷ χωρίῳ Ῥωμαίων*, The precedence here expressed argueth the eminence of that Church above the rest of the Churches about it; but Clemens directeth his epistle from the Church of Rome to that of Corinth thus: *τεκκλησία θεῶν ἡ παροικῶσα Ῥώμην, τῇ ὀκκλησίᾳ θεῶν τῇ παροικῶσῃ Κόρινθον*, whereby we understand, that the country lying under the city belonged to the Church founded in the city, and was, therefore, called *παροικία*, signifying that which we now call the diocese, in opposition to the Mother Church. That this is the reason of the name *παροικία*, appears, because Polycarp addresses his epistles to the Philippians in this style: *τεκκλησία θεῶν τῇ παροικῶσῃ Φιλίπποις*. For if the Church of the Philippians dwelt near Philippi, then the country adjoining belonged to the Church of that city. This reason, therefore, was well understood by him that writ the epistle to the Antiochians, in Ignatius's name, granting it to be of an age much inferior to his, for he inscribeth it, *τεκκλησία θεῶν τῇ παροικῶσῃ Συρίαν, τῇ οὐσῇ τῇ Ἀντιοχείᾳ*: signifying thereby that all the Christians of Syria belonged to the Church of Antiochia; for which reason, Ignatius himself, in his epistle to the Romans, calls himself Bishop of Syria, not of Antiochia; because, being bishop of the head city Church, the Christians of Syria either belonged to his Church or to the Churches that were under it: a thing so necessary to be believed, that there are many marks in his epistles to shew that the Churches also of Cilicia belonged to his charge, as we saw they did by their foundation in the Apostles' time, and as the reason of the civil government required, those parts where Paul and Barnabas first preached having continued longest in the dominion of the kings of Syria; and, therefore, continuing under the government that resided at Antiochia. And thus are the words of Clemens, in his epistle to the Corinthians, fulfilled, when he saith that the Apostles, having preached the Gospel in cities and countries, constituted bishops and ministers of those that should believe; to wit, according to the cities and countries

adjoining to them. Those marks come from the ancient records the Church hath, after the writings of the Apostles. Of the rest, there would be no end, if a man would allege them.

If any man object that it cannot be made to appear how this rule was ever observed in the Church, the extent of cathedral churches being in some countries so strait—in others, so large; the answer is, that it ceaseth not to be a rule, though the execution of it was very different in several countries, either because not understood so well as it should have been, or because the condition of some countries was not applicable to it, so as that of others. For the East, we have these words of Walafridus Strabo, lib. de Rebus Ecclesiasticis: “Fertur in Orientis partibus per singulas Vicis, &c., præfecturas singulas esse Episcoporum gubernationes;” whereby we understand that cathedral churches stood very much thicker in the Eastern parts than in the West; for thereupon it became observable to Walafridus. In Afric, if we look but into the writings of St. Augustine, we shall find hundreds of bishops resorting to one council. In Ireland alone, St. Patrick is said, by Ninius, at the first plantation of Christianity, to have founded three hundred threescore and five bishoprics. On the other side, in England, we see still how many countries remain in one diocese of Lincoln; and yet, if we look into Almain, and those mighty foundations of Charles the Great, we may find, perhaps, larger than it. The rule, notwithstanding all this, is the same—that cathedral churches be founded in cities, though cities are diversely reckoned in several countries; nay, though, perhaps, some countries where the Gospel comes have scarce anything worth the name of cities; where the rule must be executed, according to the discretion of men that have it in hand, and the condition of times. This we may generally observe, that churches were erected in greater number when they were erected without endowment(*e*)—established by temporal law; so that, in one of the African canons, it is questionable whether a bishop have many Presbyters under him; fewer where they were founded by princes professing Christianity, upon temporal endowments. And, upon this consideration, it will be no prejudice to this rule, that in Egypt, till the time of Demetrius, there was no cathedral church but that of Alexandria; if it be fit to believe the late antiquities of that Church, published out of Eutychius, because they seem to agree with that which St. Hierome reporteth of that Church. As to this day, if we believe the Jesuits, whose relation you may see in “*Godignus de Rebus Abassinorum*,” l. 32, there is but one for all Prester John’s dominion, or the country of the Abassines. For

though men could not, or would not, execute the rule, so as it took place in more civil countries, yet that such a rule there was, is easy to believe, when we see Christianity suffer as it does, in those countries professing Christ, by the neglect of it.

Before I leave this point, I will touch one argument to the whole question, drawn from common sense, presupposing historical truth. For they that place the chief power in congregations, or require at all several Presbyteries for the government of several congregations, are bound at least to shew us that congregations were thus distinguished in the times of the Apostles, if they will attribute this design to *them*, which I utterly deny. I do believe the Presbyterians have convinced those of the congregations, that, in St. Paul's time, the Churches to whom he writes contained such numbers as could by no means assemble at once; but several Churches they could not make, being not distinguished into several congregations, but meeting together, from time to time, according to opportunity and order given. About St. Cyprian's time, and not before, I find mention of congregations settled in the country; for, in his twenty-eighth epistle, you have mention of one Gaius, Presbyter, Diddensis, which was the name of some place near Carthage, the Church whereof was under the care of this Gaius; and, in the life of Pope Dionysius, about this time, it is said that he divided the dioceses into Churches; and in Epiphanius, against the Manichees, speaking of the beginning of them under Probus, about this time, there is mention of one Trypho, Presbyter, of Diodoris, a village (as it seems, by his relation there) under Archelaus, the Bishop of Caschara, in Mesopotamia. Likewise, in an epistle of Dionysius of Alexandria, reported by Eusebius (Eccles. Hist. vii. 24), there is mention of the "Presbyters, and teachers of the brethren in the villages." And those Churches of the country called Mareotis, hard by Alexandria, which Socrates (Eccles. Hist. i. 27), saith were parishes of the Church of Alexandria, in the time of Constantine, must needs be thought to have been established long before that time whereof he writes there. After this, in the canons of Ancyra and Neocæsarea, and those writings that follow, there is oftentimes difference made between city and country Presbyters. In cities, this must needs have been begun long afore, as we find mention of it at Rome, in the life of Pope Caius, where it is said that he divided the titles and cœmities among the Presbyters: and the distribution of the wards of Alexandria, and the Churches of them, mentioned by Epiphanius (Hær. lxxviii. and lxxix.), seems to have been made long before the time whereof he speaks. But when Justin Martyr says expressly

(Apoc. ii.) that, in his time, those out of the country, and those in the city, assembled in one, far was it from distinguishing settled congregations under the Apostles : which, if it be true, the position, which I have hitherto proved, must needs be admitted, that the Christians remained in several cities, and the territories of them were, by the Apostles, ordered to be divided into several distinct bodies and societies, which the Scripture calls Churches, and are now known by the name of Cathedral Churches, and the dioceses of them constituting one whole Church.

This being proved, I shall not much thank any man to quit me the position upon which the congregations are grounded ; to wit, the chief power of the people in the Church ; though it seems they are not yet agreed themselves what the power of the people should be. Morellus, in the French Churches, disputed, downright, that the state of the government in the Church ought to be democratic—the people to be sovereign ; wherein, by Beza's epistles, it appears that he was supported by Ramus : for the man whom Beza calls ὁζον' Ἀρχος, and describes by other circumlocutions, who put the French Churches to the trouble of divers synods, to suppress this position, as there it appears, can be no other than Ramus. Perhaps, Ramus, his credit in our Universities, was the first means to bring this conceit in religion among us ; for, about the time that he was most cried up in them, Brown and Barow published it : unless it be more probable to fetch it from the troubles of Francford ; for those that would take upon them to exercise the power of the keys in that estate, because they were a congregation that assembled together for the service of God, which power could not stand, unless recourse might be had to excommunication, did, by express consequence, challenge the public power of the Church to all congregations, which I have shewed to be otherwise ; and the contest there related, between one of the people and one of the pastors, shews that they grounded themselves upon the right of the people. So true it is, that I said afore, that the Presbyterians have still held the stirrup to those of the congregations, to put *themselves* out of the saddle. As now the design of the congregations is refined, they will not have it said that they make the people chief in the Church ; for they give them *power*, which they will have subject to that *authority* which they place in the pastors and elders ; which serves not the turn. We have an instance against it in the state of Rome, after they had driven away the Tarquins : they placed the authority in the senate, and power in the people, and I suppose the success of time shewed that which Bodine disputes against Polybius (De Repub. ii. 2), to be most true—that the state was

thereby made a democracy. So, the congregations challenging to themselves right to make themselves Churches, and, by consequence, whom they please pastors, must needs, by consequence, reduce the authority they pretend, to what measure the people shall please, whom, by their proceedings, they enable to make and unmake members and pastors at their pleasure. But I dispute not the consequence of their design, before they declare what they are agreed upon in it. Besides, they conceive they have this right in the Church, because they are saints ; as Anabaptists conceive that, by the same title, they have the right to the goods of this world, and, as Christians, conceive they have those rights which they pretend to, in the visible Church, by lawful ordination and baptism ; and that they are saints, they seem to presume upon this ground, that they have been admitted to such a congregation, upon covenant to live in such society, for which they separate from the Church. It shall be enough to level the grounds and reasons from Scripture, upon which they have parted from the Church, under pretence of recovering the freedom of saints, before they are agreed wherein this freedom consists, and how far it extends. And, truly, that which I have hitherto proved seems to be a peremptory prescription against their pretence ; for if the Apostles ordered the bodies of several Churches to consist of the whole numbers of Christians contained in several cities, and in the territories of them, when no common sense can possibly imagine that they could assemble altogether, at any time, for the service of God, it follows of necessity that the power of governing of those Churches was not deposited by the Apostles in the body of the people, whereof those Churches did or should consist. For where the power is in the people, there the whole body of the people must have means to assemble, to take order in such things as concern the state of it. Wherefore, the assemblies of the Church being only for divine service, and at those assemblies it being impossible that all the people of those Churches should meet, common sense must pronounce that the power of taking order in the common affairs of Churches is not deposited by the Apostles in the body of the people.

Another exception there is to all, or most of the particulars, which they allege out of the Scriptures, far more peremptory than this : for those things upon which they ground the right and interest of the people in the Church, were done under the Apostles ; that is, not only in their time, but also in concurrence with their right and power in the government of the Church. So that if we believe, or if we prove, the chief power to have been then in the Apostles, it cannot, by the Scriptures which

they produce, be proved to remain in the people, because their evidence cannot prove any greater power or right to be *now* in the people than belonged to them when the (things which) Scriptures allege were said or done under the Apostles. Now I suppose I shall not need to entreat any man to grant me that the sovereign power of the Church was then in the Apostles, which their commission will easily evince. The name of an Apostle seemeth to have been borrowed by our Lord from the ordinary use of that people; for, in their law, it ordinarily signifieth a man's proxy, or commissary, deputed to some purpose; and, therefore, the signification of it in the Scriptures is very large: so that when we read of Epaphroditus, Apostle of the Philippians (Phil. ii. 25, 30), or of Luke and Titus, Apostles of the Churches (2 Cor. viii. 19, 20, 23), we are not to conceive, by this name, anything like the office of the Apostles of Christ; for these latter are plainly called Apostles of the Churches, as deputed by them to carry their contributions to Jerusalem; and Epaphroditus of the Philippians, as employed by them to wait upon and furnish St. Paul with his necessary charges at Rome. The power of Christ's Apostles, then, must not be valued by the *name* of Apostle, nor by the person of our Lord Christ that sends them, for he might have sent other manner of men upon inferior errands, and all been Apostles; but by the work which they are trusted with, expressed in their commission—"As my Father sent me"—"Whose soever sins ye remit"—and "Go, preach and teach all nations." For if God ordain his Church to be one visible society, to serve him in the profession of the Gospel, and trust only his Apostles and the Church with the power of the keys (the root of all ecclesiastical power, as hath been said) either the Church must challenge it against the Apostles, which is not but *by* them, or it must be understood to have been then in the Church, because it was in the Apostles, in whom it was before the Church, which was founded by them; whereupon the office of the Apostles is called ἐπισκοπή, a bishopric, before the Church was whereof they were bishops; to wit, in Judas (Acts i. 9), a meaning easy to be read in the number of them. For the Church being the spiritual Israel; as Israel, according to the flesh, coming of twelve patriarchs, had always twelve princes of their tribes, and seventy Presbyters, members of the great consistory, to govern them in the greatest matters, concerning the state of the whole people, under one king, or judge, or under God when they had neither king nor judge; so did our Saviour appoint twelve patriarchs, as it were, of his spiritual people, seventy governors of another rank, both under the name of Apostles, in whom should rest the whole power

of governing that people, whereof himself, in Heaven, remains always King.

A perfect evidence hereof is the deriving of other power from them, as theirs is derived from Christ. We read in Scriptures of Evangelists, and we read of another sort of Apostles, which, if we understand not to be of the number of the seventy, we must needs conceive to be so called, because they were Apostles *of the Apostles*, that is, persons sent by the twelve Apostles to assist them in the work committed to their trust; which it is plain could not be executed by them in person alone. And, indeed, those whom the Scripture calls "false Apostles" (2 Cor. xi. 13), and "that said they were Apostles, and were not" (Apoc. ii. 2), what can we imagine they were, but such as pretended to be employed by other Apostles (perhaps by St. Peter, to Corinth, who had a hand in the founding of that Church, we learn, by Dionysius of Corinth, in Eusebius, Eccles. Histor. ii. 25, agreeing with the beginning of St. Paul's first epistle), but intended, indeed, under their names and authorities, to pull down that which were built by their fellow Apostles? And in this sense, perhaps, St. Paul calls Andronicus and Junius eminent among the Apostles (Rom. xvi. 7), because it may be they were employed by himself, or by St. Peter, about the Gospel at Rome. And hereby we may take measure what Evangelists were. For, seeing it appears, by the Scriptures, that they were the Apostles' scholars, deputed by them, and limited to such employment as they found most proper for their assistance, it is manifest that they could have no authority but derived from the Apostles: a thing perfectly agreeing with the custom that had always been among God's people. For all prophets whom God employed upon his message, and may, therefore, be properly called his Apostles (as our Lord Christ is called the Apostle of our profession, Heb. iii. 1), had their disciples to wait upon them, which is called "ministering to them," in the language of the Scripture. Thus Joshua, the minister of Moses (Exod. xxiv. 13). "Elizeus poured water on the hands of Elias," as the chief of his scholars, that expected a double portion of his spirit (2 Kings, ii. 9, iii. 11). Thus the Baptist saith "he is not worthy to loose or take away our Saviour's shoes" (Matt. iii. 11; Mar. i. 7); that is, to be his disciple; for by Maimoni, in the title of learning the Law, cap. v., we learn that the disciples of the Jews' doctors were to do that service for their masters. Hereupon saith Christ (Luke xxii. 26), "I am among you as he that ministereth;" to wit, not as a master, but as a disciple. Thus the chief of our Lord's disciples, whom he had chosen from the beginning to be with him,

receiving his commission, became his Apostles, having waited on his person, and, by familiar conversation, learned his doctrine better than others. Whereupon it may be said, in the primitive government of Churches, that, to make an Apostle, it was requisite to have seen our Lord in the flesh ; and we know that he appeared to St. Paul after death, to advance him to that rank by this privilege (Mar. iii. 14; Matt. x. 1, 4.) And shall we think that the Apostles did not, as their Lord and all the prophets before him had done, choose themselves scholars, that, by waiting on them, might learn their doctrine, and become fit to be employed under them and after them ? If we do, we shall misunderstand the most remarkable circumstances of Scripture ; for we may easily observe, that those who are called, in the Scriptures, Evangelists, are such as first waited upon the Apostles ; as St. Mark upon St. Peter ; Timothy and St. Luke upon St. Paul (Acts xvi. 1, xix. 22) ; as Mark upon Paul and Barnabas (Acts xiii. 5) ; and Mark again (whether the same or another) upon St. Paul, (2 Tim. iv. 11). And, therefore, I easily grant both Timothy and Titus to have been Evangelists, though the Scripture says it but of one (2 Tim. iv. 5), because I see them both companions of St. Paul, that is, his scholars and ministers ; and, therefore, find it very reasonable that he should employ Titus into Dalmatia, to preach the Gospel in those parts where himself had left, hoping to go further, and carry it beyond into Illyricum, whereof Dalmatia was a part ; as you may see by comparing the Scriptures, 2 Tim. iv. 10 ; Rom. xv. 19 ; 2 Cor. x. 16 ; Tit. iii. 12. For thus also, of the seven ministers to the Apostles at Jerusalem, you see Stephen and Philip employed in preaching the Gospel, and this latter called, therefore, expressly an Evangelist (Acts vi. 9, viii. 5, 12, xxi. 8.) And, therefore, it is not possible for any man *out of the Scriptures* to distinguish between the office of Evangelists and those whom I shewed to have been Apostles *of the Apostles*. And thereby the conclusion remains firm, that all ecclesiastical power at that time remained, and for future times is to be derived from the Apostles, when we see by the Scriptures that the Evangelists derived *their* office and authority from their appointment. And, indeed, how can common sense endure to apprehend it otherwise, especially admitting that which hath been discoursed of the power of the keys in admitting into the Church ? That being made Christians by the Apostles, because by them convinced to believe that they were God's messengers, whom they stood bound to obey, they should, nevertheless, by being Christians, obtain the power of regulating and concluding the Apostles themselves in matters concerning the community of the Church (which,

what it meant, or that such a society should be, they could not so much as imagine, but by them), is a thing no common sense can admit without prejudice. Those that purchase communion by lawful conquest in the world, become thereby able to dispose of all their subjects, because they give them their lives, that is, themselves. The Church is a people subdued to Christ by the Apostles, not by force, but by the sword of the Spirit; and though to freedom, yet that freedom consists in the state of particular Christians towards God, nor is the public power of the Church, otherwise than it is conveyed lawfully from them that had it before the Church. Indeed, visible Christianity is a condition requisite to make a man capable of ecclesiastical power; and the Church is then in best estate when a legal presumption of *invisible* Christianity is most reasonable: but if saints, because saints, have power and right to govern the Church, then follows the position imposed on Wickliff and Huss, in the Council of Constance, and condemned by all Christians, that ecclesiastical power holds and fails with grace; which will not fail to draw after it the like consequence in secular matters, pernicious to all civil societies; contradicting the principle laid down at the beginning, that Christianity calls no man to any advantage of this world, but to the cross. Therefore, no Christian or saint, *as saint or Christian*, hath any right or power in the Church, but that which is lawfully derived from the order of the Apostles. Those of the congregations* use to allege St. Peter's apology to the Jewish Christians for conversing with Cornelius and his company (Acts xi. 9); as also that of St. Paul (Col. iv. 17), speaking to the body of the Church at Colosse, "Say to Archippus, look to the ministry which thou hast received, to fulfil it;" as if St. Peter or Archippus must be afraid of excommunication, if they render not a good account of their actions to the people. By which it may appear how truly I have said, that the power they give the people is in check to that power which was exercised by the Apostles. But if we reason not amiss, it would be a great prejudice to Christians, that St. Peter could not inform Christian people of the reason of his doings which they understood not, but he must make them his sovereign; or that St. Paul, conveying his commands to Archippus, by an epistle directed to the whole Church, should be thought to invest the people in that power by which he commands Archippus. They allege also the people of the Church of Jerusalem present at the council there, and joined in the letter, by which the

* Independents or Congregationalists.

decree is signified and conveyed to the Churches of Syria and Cilicia (Acts xv. 4, 12, 23). But of this I have spoken already, and am very willing to leave all men to judge by the premises, whether it is probable, that for resolution in a doubt, which such persons as Paul and Barnabas could not determine, as to the body of the Church, it can be thought that they resorted to Jerusalem, as to the *brethren*, or as to the *Apostles*; whether it can be imagined that the people of the Church at Jerusalem could prescribe in any way, either of power, or of authority, or illumination, unto the Church of Antioch, and the public persons of it. Lastly, whether the arrow is not shot beyond the mark, when it is argued that this decree is the act of the people, because it appears that they assent to it, seeing we know, by the premises, that they were bound to the acts of the Apostles. So, in the power of the keys and excommunication, what can be so plain as that St. Paul gives sentence upon the incestuous person at Corinth, and obliges the Church there to execute his decree, as he calls it, in express terms? (2 Cor. v. 3, 4). I conceive I have read an answer to this in some of their writings, that this epistle is Scripture, and, therefore, the matter of it commanded by God. But let me instance in the result of the council at Jerusalem. The Church of Jerusalem was tied by virtue of the decree, for to them there was no epistle sent; therefore the Church of Antiochia, and the rest of the Churches to whom that epistle *was* sent (which we have, Acts xv. 23), were tied by virtue of the *decree*, not by virtue of the *epistle* by which they merely knew themselves tied. And let me put the case here: had St. Paul been at Corinth, and decreed that which he decreeth by this epistle, had not the Church been tied, unless he had sent them an epistle, or otherwise made it appear to them that he had a revelation from God on purpose, having made appearance to them that he was the Apostle of Christ? Believe himself in that case, when he says, he will do as much absent as present (2 Cor. xi. 11). And again, "When I come, I shall bewail divers" (2 Cor. xii. 20, 21); that is, excommunicate them, or put them to penance, as I have said. Remember the miraculous effect of excommunication in the Apostles' time, when, by visible punishments inflicted on the excommunicate by evil angels, it appeared that they were cast out of the shadow of God's tabernacle: and it will seem as probable that this is the rod which St. Paul threatens the Corinthians with (1 Cor. iv. 21; 2 Cor. x. 2, 8), as "that many were sick there," because they abused the eucharist (1 Cor. xi. 30.) Therefore, if this *effect* of the sentence came from the Apostles, the sentence itself also came. Here appears a necessary argument

from the legislative power of the Apostles to the whole Church. For as no Christian can deny that the constitutions of the Apostles oblige the Church, so it is manifest that they do not oblige it *because* they are written in the Scripture, for they were all in force in the Church before the Scriptures were written in which they are related; neither is there evidence that they were first delivered to the Church, with *assurance* that they were, by express revelation, commanded to be delivered to the Church, or because they were passed by votes of the people; but by virtue of the general commission of the Apostles, being received, in that quality, of those that became Christians, and so made a Church. So, in matter of ordinations, it is well known who they are that have made the people believe, that Paul and Barnabas ordained Presbyters in the Churches of their founding by the voices of the people, signified by the word *χειροτονήσαντες* (Acts xiv. 22); which being admitted, it is but an easy consequence to infer, that all congregations are absolute, because, making their Presbyters, they must needs first make themselves Churches. But he that reads the text without prejudice, easily sees what the act of ordaining is here attributed to the people. They, the Apostles, ordained (*for*) them, to wit, the Church or people, Presbyters: therefore, this Scripture speaks not of election by holding up of the people's hands, but of ordination by laying on the hands of the Apostles. And, therefore, in the choice of seven Deacons, it is manifest that the Apostles, though they gave way to the people to nominate, yet reserved themselves the approving of the persons; otherwise the people might have sinned, and the Apostles borne the blame of it. For when St. Paul saith, "Lay hands suddenly on no man, nor participate of other men's sins" (2 Tim. v. 22), it is manifest that he who imposes hands ought to have power *not* to impose, because he sins imposing amiss. Last of all, let us consider how liberally the Church of Jerusalem parted with whole estates; the Church of Corinth maintained their feasts of love, whereof we read (1 Cor. xi. 17). The same Corinthians, with other Churches, offered to the support of the Churches in Judea (2 Cor. viii. 1). The Philippians sent to supply St. Paul (Phil. ii. 25, 30, iv. 20); and all the rest, which we find recorded in the New Testament, of the oblations of the faithful to the maintenance of God's service; whence it shall appear, in due time, that the endowment of the Church is estated upon it. And then let common sense judge, whether this came from the understanding, and motion, and proper devotion of the people, or from their *Christianity* obliging them to follow that order, which the authority and doctrine of the

Apostles should shew them to be requisite for their profession, and the support of the Church at that time.

By all this, as it will easily appear, that the chief interest and right in disposing of Church matters could not belong to the people under the Apostles, so it is *not* my purpose to say, that at any time the people ought to have *no* manner of right or interest in the same. For if the practice under the Apostles be the best evidence upon which we can ground law to the Church, then it is requisite to the good estate of the Church, and necessary for those that can dispose of the public order of it, to procure that it may be such as may give the people reasonable satisfaction in those things wherein they are concerned. In the meantime, as no water can ascend higher than it descended before, so can no people have any further right and power in Church matters than that which the people had under the Apostles, because that is all the evidence upon which their interest can be grounded and acknowledged. Less, is not to be granted; more, they must not require.

I may now proceed, I conceive, to resolve generally upon what principles anything questionable in Christianity is determinable; and as frankly as briefly do affirm, that there are but two sorts of means to resolve us in anything of that nature—tradition and argument, authority and reason, history and logic: for whatsoever any artist or divine hath said of the great use of the languages in discovering the true meaning of the original Scriptures, by the ancient translations as well as the originals (which I allow as much as they demand), they must give me leave to observe, that seeing all languages are certain laws of speaking, which have the force of signifying by being delivered to posterity upon agreement of their predecessors, all that help is duly ascribed to tradition, which we have from the languages. Indeed, this is no tradition of the Church, no more than all history and historical truth, concerning the times, the places, the persons mentioned in the Scriptures, concerning the laws, the customs, the fashions, and orders practised by persons mentioned in the Scriptures, in all particulars whereof the Scripture speaks; which, whether it be delivered by Christians or not Christians, as far as the common reason of men alloweth or warranteth it for historical truth, is to be admitted into consequence in enquiring the meaning of the Scriptures; and without it all pretence of languages is pedantic and contemptible, as that which gives

the true reason to the language of the Scripture, whatsoever it import in vulgar use. This help being applied to the text of the Scripture, it will be of consequence to consider the process of the discourse, pursuing that which may appear to be intended, not by any man's fancy, but by those marks which, cleared by the helps premised, may appear to signify it; which is the work of reason, supposing the truth of the Scriptures. And whereas other passages of Scripture either are clearer of themselves, or, being made clearer by using the same helps, may seem to argue the meaning of that which is questioned: whereas other parts of Christianity, resolved afore, may serve as principles to infer, by consequence of reason, the truth of that which remains in doubt (not to be imputed, therefore, to reason, but to the truth from which reason argues, as believed and not seen): this also is no less the work of reason, supposing the truth of the Scriptures. But whereas there be two sorts of things questionable in Christianity; and all that is questionable merely in point of truth hath relation to and dependance upon the rule of faith, as consequent to it, or consistent with it, if we will have it true; or otherwise, if false, I acknowledge, in the first place, that nothing of this nature can be questionable, further than as some Scripture, the meaning whereof is not evident, createth the doubt; and, therefore, that the determination of the meaning of that Scripture is the determination of the truth questionable: for seeing the truth of God's nature and counsels, which Christianity revealeth, are things which no Christian can pretend to have known otherwise than by revelation from God; and that we have evidence, that whatsoever we have by Scripture is revealed, but, by the tradition of the Church, no further than all the Church agreeth in it (all that wherein it agreeth being supposed to be in the Scripture, and much more than that); it followeth that nothing can be affirmed as consequent to, or consistent with, that which the tradition of the Church containeth, but by the Scripture and from the Scripture. So that I willingly admit, whatsoever is alleged from divers sayings of the Fathers, that whatsoever is not proved out of the Scriptures is as easily rejected as it is affirmed, limiting the meaning of it as I have said; but whatsoever there is Scripture produced to prove, seeing we have prescribed that nothing can be admitted for the true meaning of any Scripture that is against the catholic tradition of the Church, it behoveth that evidence be made, that what is pretended to be true hath been taught in the Church so expressly as may infer the allowance of it; and therefore is not against the rule of faith. But this being cleared, so manifest as it is, that the Church hath not the privilege of

infallibility in any express act which is not justifiable from the universal original practice of the Church, whether in prescribing what is to be believed, what is to be professed, or what is to be done; so manifest must it remain, that nothing can be resolved by plurality of votes of ecclesiastical writers as to the point of truth; for then were the privilege of infallibility in the votes of those writers, which themselves disclaim, from the substance of what they write; and it is to say that what had no such privilege when it was written, if it have more authors survive that hold it, shall be, and must be, held infallible: which consequences being ridiculous, it followeth that, for the trial of truth within the bounds afore-said, recourse must be had to the means premised; and the effect of those means every day's experience witnesseth. For the obligation which all men think they have firmly to hold that which, by these means, they have all concluded from the Scriptures, is the consequence of these principles in expounding the same; which obligation, though sometimes imaginary, in regard that, between contradictory reasons, the consequence may be equally firm on both sides, yet that it cannot be otherwise he that believes the truth of Christianity must needs imagine: for true principles truly used necessarily produce nothing but true consequences.

Which, if it be so, why should any question be made that the Church may, and sometimes ought to proceed in determining the truth of things, questionable upon occasion of the Scriptures, concerning the rule of Christian faith? Or, which is all one, that the exercise of this power by the Church produceth, in those that are of the Church, an obligation of submitting to the same? Indeed, here be two obligations, which sometimes may contradict one another, and, therefore, whatsoever the matter of them be, the effects of them cannot be contraries. The use of the means to determine the meaning of the Scriptures produceth an obligation of holding that which followeth from it; which obligation no man can have, or ought to imagine he hath, before the due use of such means, whether his estate in the Church oblige him to use them or not. But the visible determination of the Church obliges all that are of the Church not to scandalize the unity thereof, by professing contrary to the same. And to both these obligations the same man may be subject, as the matter may be, to wit, as one that hath resolved the question upon true principles, not to believe the contrary; and as one of the Church, that believes the Church faileth, in that for which he is bound not to break the unity thereof, not to profess against what the Church determineth: for I am bold to say again, that there is no society, no commu-

nion in the world, whether civil, ecclesiastical, military, or whatsoever it be, that can subsist, unless we grant that the act of superior power obligeth sometimes, when it is ill used. In the mean time, I say not that this holds always, and in matters of whatsoever concernment; nor do take upon me generally to resolve this, no more than what is the matter of the rule of faith which he that believes may be saved; and he that positively believes not all, cannot. It shall be enough for me, if I may give an opinion, whether that which we complain of be of value to disoblige us to our superiors or not; as, concerning what is questioned amongst us, whether it be of the rule of faith or not. But this I shall say, that to justify the use of this power towards God, requireth not only a persuasion of the truth, competent to the weight of the point in question, in those that determine for the Church, but also a probable judgment, that the determination which they shall make will be the means to reduce contrary opinions to that sense which they see so great authority profess and enjoin; for without doubt there can be no such means to dissolve the unity of the Church as a precipitate and immature determination of something that is become questionable (for effectually to proceed to exercise ecclesiastical communion upon terms contrary to that which hath been received afore, is actually to dissolve the unity of the Church); the engagement to make good that which men shall have once done being the most powerful witchcraft and ligature in the world to blind them from seeing that which all men see besides themselves, or, at least, from confessing to see that which they cannot but see.

But if we speak of things which concern the communion of the Church, in those offices which God is to be served with by Christians, or that tend to maintain the same, besides the meaning and truth of the Scriptures, there remains a further question, what is or ought to be law to the Church, and oblige them that are of the Church (seeing that whatsoever is in the Scripture obligeth not the Church for law, though obliged to believe it for truth), the resolution whereof will require evidence of the reason for which everything was done by the Apostles (for as it holds or not, so the constitution grounded upon it is to hold, either always or only as it holds); and this reason must be evidenced by the authority of the Church admitting that reason into force, whether by express act or by silent practice. When the Israelites are commanded to eat the passover in haste, with their loins girt and their staves in their hands, there is appearance enough that the intent of it was only concerning that passover which first they celebrated in

Egypt, not for an order always to continue, because then the case required haste, and because then the angel passed over their houses, upon the door-posts whereof the blood was commanded to be sprinkled, that by that mark he might pass over them to smite the Egyptians. For though Philo would have the passover to be celebrated at home, and not at Jerusalem (though, perhaps, only by those of the dispersions, those that dwelt in the land of promise being all tied to resort to Jerusalem), yet all that acknowledge the Talmud think it not lawful to celebrate it but at Jerusalem, contenting themselves with the supper, and abating the lamb, as one of those sacrifices which the Law forbiddeth everywhere, but before the ark. But had not the practice of the nation, and the authority of the elders, trusted by the Law to determine such matters, appeared in the business, our Lord, who, according to his own doctrine, was subject to their constitutions, had not had a rule for his proceeding. So, in the infancy of Christianity, it is no marvel if the Christians at Jerusalem entertained daily communion, even at board also, among themselves, and that they gave their estates to the maintenance of it, not by any law of communion of goods, but as the common necessity required; for what could make more towards the advancement of Christianity? And when at Corinth, and in other Churches, the communion was in use, though not so frequent, nor giving up their estates, but offering the first-fruits of them to the maintenance of it; yet still was the eucharist frequented at these occasions as it was first instituted by our Lord, as, by the express words of Tertullian, we understand that it was, even in his time. But when the number of Christians so increased, that the use of the like communion could not stand with the maintenance of the world, which Christianity supposeth when the same discipline could not prevail in so vast a body which had ruled at the beginning, is it, then, any marvel to see these feasts of love laid aside (whether with the eucharist or without it), and the sacrament of the supper of our Lord become so unfrequented at supper, that it is strange to the rest of Christendom to see it so used in Egypt on Maunday Thursday, in remembrance merely of the primitive custom?

What shall we say of the order of widows, whereof St. Paul writeth? Is it not manifest that there was then a necessity of such persons as might give attendance upon the sick, and poor, and impotent of every Church—that might minister hospitality to those strangers that should travel by every Church, and were to receive entertainment according to the custom? And is it not manifest that when, Christianity increasing, daily oblations

could not serve for this purpose, but standing endowments were to be provided, this course could not serve the turn, nor the office continue necessary, when the work ceased? There is nothing more evident than that which I have said in another place concerning the rigour of penance under the Apostles; nothing to intimate that they forbade any sin, how grievous soever, to be admitted to reconciliation with God by the Church: many evident arguments that they left it in the power of the Church to grant it or not. But the increase of Christianity abating the sincerity and zeal of Christians made it so necessary to abate of that rigour, and to declare free access even for adulterers, murderers, and apostates, to the worship of idols, that Montanus first, and afterwards the Novatians, are justly counted schismatics, for departing from the Church upon that which the change of times made necessary for the preservation of unity in it; which the Donatists remain much more liable to, breaking out afterwards upon a branch of the same cause; yet is nothing more evident, to them that use not the unction of the sick, than that instance: for what is or what can be alleged why an express precept of the Apostles, backed with the uninterrupted practice of the Church, should not take place, but the appearance that the reason for which it was commanded ceaseth, the miraculous curing of bodily sickness no more remaining in the Church, and so drawing after it the ceremony which signified and procured it? But in St. Paul's dispute of women covering their heads in the Church the case is not so clear, unless we admit two suppositions, both evident upon the credit of historical truth. The first, that neither Jews, Greeks, or Romans, ever used, or knew what it meant, to uncover the head in sign of reverence; what use soever they made of hats or caps, as they had use of them (though not to continue all as we have), seeing you never find that they put them off in sign of reverence, it is impossible that keeping them on should be understood among them for a sign of irreverence; and therefore that the whole dispute nothing concerns the question of preaching with a hat or a cap on in the Church. The second is that which we learn by Tertullian's book, "*De Velandis Virginibus*;" the subject whereof being, that virgins are not exempted, by any privilege, from veiling their faces in the Church, is argued by consequences drawn from this dispute of St. Paul; and, namely, it is alleged that in the Church of Corinth at that time, according to St. Paul's order, they veiled their faces: whereby it appears that St. Paul was understood to speak of a veil, which, covering the head, came down before the face; which St. Paul, therefore, one while calls ἐπὶ κεφαλῇς ἔχειν, another while,

κατα κεφαλῆς ἔχων, signifying that which is so upon the head, as it comes down before the face; in English, a veil : and so Clemens Alexandrinus, and others, understand it. This being the case, what is the reason, which ceasing, the precept thereupon may be thought to cease? Surely nothing else but because those Christians which overcame the Roman empire did not think that civility,* and the modesty of women, required them to keep their faces veiled; as the opinion and custom of Jews, Greeks, and Romans, to whom St. Paul preached, did require. And though he argueth that nature, which teacheth women everywhere to let their hair grow at length, teaches them to veil their faces, because, even unclothed, they are provided of a veil; yet when he addeth, “If any man be contentious, we have no such custom, neither the Churches of God,” it is manifest he intends no law of nature, but an inference which, civility making from nature, was fit to be maintained by the custom of the Church, as that custom for the unity of the Church. But when those nations, whose civility had not made the same inference, received Christianity, is it marvel that Christianity should not impose that upon them, which, being no part of Christianity, had no ground, unless they would be bound to receive the civility of other nations upon the account of the common Christianity? In the decree of the Apostles at Jerusalem, prohibiting the Gentilish Christians things sacrificed to idols, strangled, and blood, it appeareth that all the sons of Noe received seven precepts from God, which, when other nations fell away to idols, remained visible only in the practice of such as, not being Jews nor circumcised, are, nevertheless, in sundry places of the Law, allowed to live among them in the land of promise, under the name of “the stranger within the gates:” for this allowance was upon condition of undertaking these seven precepts. When, therefore, Gentiles were admitted to Christianity with Jews, and the question resolved that they were free of the Law of Moses, and yet an expedient was requisite not to scandalize the Jews by the use of that freedom, that Jews and Gentiles might the more kindly join in one Church; it appears that the precept of blessing the name of God, that is, worshipping God, was sufficiently provided for by the Christian faith. The precepts of maintaining courts of judicatures, and of forbearing rapine, were sufficiently provided for by the government of the empire; and the precept of the Sabbath out of date† under the Gospel. It remaineth, therefore, that by prohibiting things sacrificed to idols, and fornication, with that which was strangled, and blood, the Apostles establish such compliance between

* Civilization

† From time immemorial.

Jewish and Gentilish Christians as was in use between Jews and strangers, proselytes in the land of promise. Not as if Christians had not sufficiently renounced idolatry in receiving the faith, or as if it were not free for them, being Christians, to eat God's creatures which perhaps might have been sacrificed to idols; but because, as I said afore, the Jews had a custom not to eat anything till they had enquired whether sacrificed to idols or consecrated, by offering the first-fruits thereof; which scrupulosity those who did not observe they counted not so much enemies to idols as they ought to be; which opinion of their fellow Christians was not so consistent with that opinion of Christianity which was requisite. Nor as if fornication were not sufficiently prohibited by Christianity, but because simple fornication being accounted no sin, but merely indifferent among the Gentiles, all the professions and all the decrees that could be made were little enough to persuade the Jews that their fellow Christians of the Gentiles held it in the like detestation as themselves.

Now, though we find that the Christians did sometimes, and in most places, forbear blood, and things strangled and offered to idols, even where this reason ceased; and that, perhaps, out of an opinion that the decree of the Apostles took hold of them (in doing which they did but abridge themselves of the common freedom of Christians); yet, seeing the Apostles give no such sign of any intent of reviving that which was once a law to all that came from Noe, but forgotten and never published again, it followeth that the Church is no more led by the reason of their decree, than those Churches of Rome and Corinth were whom St. Paul licenses to eat all meats in general (as the Romans), or things sacrificed to idols expressly (as the Corinthians), excepting the case of scandal (which our common Christianity excepteth); setting aside the decree of Jerusalem, which St. Paul allegeth not, and naming two cases wherein that scandal might fall out, as excepting no other case. But in all these instances, and others that might be brought, as it was visible to the Church whether the reasons for which such alterations were brought into the Church continued in force or not, so was it both necessary and sufficient, for them that might question whether they were tied to them or not, to see the express act, or the custom of the Church, for their assurance: for what other ground had they to assure their consciences, even against the Scripture, in all ages of the Church? For if these reasons be not obvious, if every one admit them not, much less will every one find a resolution wherein all may agree, and all scandal and dissension may be suppressed.

Supposing, now, the Church a society, and the same, from the first to the second, coming from Christ, by God's appointment; let it be considered what is the difference between the state thereof under the Apostles and under Constantine, or now under so many sovereignties as have shared these parts of the empire; and let any understanding that can apprehend what laws or what customs are requisite to the preservation of unity in the communion of the Church, in the one and in the other estate—I say, let any such understanding pronounce whether the same laws can serve the Church as we see it now, or as we read of it under Constantine, and as it was under the Apostles. He that says yea, will make any man that understands say that he understands not what he speaks of;—he that says nay, must yield, that even the laws given the Church by the Apostles oblige not the Church, so far as they become useless to the purpose for which they are intended; seeing it is manifest, that all laws of all societies whatsoever, so far as they become unserviceable, so far must needs cease to oblige. And the Apostles, though they might know, by the Spirit, the state of the Church that should come after, yet, had they intended to give laws to that state, they had not given laws to the state which was when they lived and gave laws. The authority, therefore, of the Apostles remaining unquestionable, and the ordinances also by them brought into the Church for the maintenance of God's service according to Christianity, the Church must needs have power, not only to limit and determine such things as were never limited nor determined by the Apostles, but even those things also, the determination whereof made by the Apostles, by the change of time and the state of the Church therewith, are become evidently useless and unserviceable to the intent for which it standeth. And if it be true that I said afore, that all power produceth an obligation of obeying it in some things (I say not in all, as afore), even when it is abused in respect of God and of a good conscience, then is the act of the Church so far a warrant to all those that shall follow it so far, even in things which a man not only suspects, but sees to be ill ordered by those that act in behalf of it. This is that which all the variety and multitude of canons, rites, and ordinances, which hath been introduced into the Church, before there was cause of making any change without consent of the whole, evidenceth; being nothing else but new limitations of those ordinances which the Apostles either supposed or introduced for the maintenance of God's service, determining the circumstances according to the which they were to be exercised. For if there were always cause, since the beginning, for particular

Churches (that is, parts of the whole) to make such changes, without consent of the whole, as might justly cause a breach between that part and the whole, then was there never any such thing as a Catholic Church, which all Christians profess to believe. And, truly, the Jews' Law may be an argument, as it is a pattern, of the same right; which, notwithstanding an express precept of "neither adding to it, nor taking from it," unless we admit a power of determining circumstances not limited by the letter of it, becomes unserviceable, and not to be put in practice: as may easily appear to any man that shall peruse the cases that are put, upon supposition of those precepts which determine not the same. Whereupon, a power is provided, by the same law, of inflicting capital punishment upon any that, not resting upon the determination established by those that have authority in behalf of the whole, shall tend to divide the Synagogue.

I intend not hereby to say that the power of giving law to the Church cannot be so well abused that it may at length enable or oblige parts of the Church to provide for themselves such an order in the communion of Christianity as may stand with the Scriptures and the unity of the Church, though without consent of the whole Church of the present time. For it is evident that this disorder may be so great in the laws of the Church as to make them useless and unserviceable, not only to the profession of the true faith or to the service of God, for which the communion of the Church standeth, but even to the unity of the Church itself, which is the prime precept that all which the Church does ought to aim at. It is evident also that this is the true cause which the reformation hath to dispute against the Church of Rome. But this I say, that though particular Churches must necessarily have their particular laws (which are the differences which several Churches observe in the exercise of the same ordinances), yet may not any particular Church make itself any law which may tend to separation, by disclaiming the unity of the whole Church, or either expressly, or by due construction, denying the same. This is done by abrogating Apostolical traditions as inconsistent with Christianity, for the matter of them, not because the reason and ground of them is ceased: for they who disclaim the authority of the Apostles cannot acknowledge the unity of the Church; and they who make Apostolical ordinances inconsistent with Christianity, do necessarily disclaim the authority of the Apostles. The same is done by abrogating the constitution of the Church, done by virtue of the authority left it by the Apostles; for to disclaim the Church in this authority, is to disclaim the

Apostles that left it. And though this authority may be so abused that particular Churches (that is to say, parts of the whole Church) may thereby be authorized, yea, obliged, to provide for themselves, without the consent of the whole, yet not against the authority of the whole—that is to say, of the Apostles from whence it proceedeth; nor is every abuse thereof a cause sufficient to warrant the scandals that such proceedings necessarily produce. And this shall be enough for me to have said in this place; having, I suppose, established those principles, by the right application whereof, he that can make it may judge what is the true plea whereby that separation, which the reformation hath occasioned, must either be justified or be thought unjustifiable.

From that which hath been said, the difference between heresy and schism, and the true nature of both crimes, in opposition to Christianity, may and ought to be inferred in this place; because it ought not to be forgotten (which ought daily to be lamented) that, at the beginning of the troubles, it was questioned in the Lords' House whether there were any such crimes or not, or whether they were only bugbears to scare children with; and that hereupon every man sees England overrun with both. The word *heresy* signifies nothing but *choice*, and therefore the signification of it is sometimes indifferent, importing no more than a way of professing and living which a man voluntarily chooseth, as St. Paul useth it, when he saith that he “lived, according to the most exact *heresy* of the Jews' religion, a Pharisee” (Acts xxvi. 5); for it is known that, besides the necessary profession of the Jews' law, there were three sects, which no man by being a Jew was obliged to, but by his own free choice—the Pharisees, the Sadducees, and the Essenes; which being all maintained by the Law, as it was then used, the common name of them cannot signify any crime among them to whom St. Paul then spoke, whatsoever we believe of the Sadducees. And thus it sounds among them who use it to signify the sects of the Grecian philosophers, allowed by those who embraced them not; as in the title of Lucian's discourse—*πῆς ἀρεσέων*. But because it is too ordinary for men, of their own choice, to depart from the rule to which they are or ought to stand obliged, thereupon the word is most part used to signify the free choice of a rule of living, contrary to that rule which they stood obliged to before. In which sense Adam is called, by Tertullian, the first heretic, as he that first departed from the will of God to live according to his own. Supposing, now, that Christianity obliges, both to the rule of faith and to the society of the Church by virtue of that rule (because

the belief of the Catholic Church is part of it, as hath been declared afore); it is manifest, that whosoever disbelieves any part of that rule (the belief whereof is the condition upon which a man becomes a Christian), and thereby forfeits his interest in those promises which God hath made to Christians, doth or may either lead others or follow in living according to that belief which he chooseth, whether professing it as a Christian ought to profess his Christianity or not. And in this sense it seems to be used by St. Paul, when he says (Titus iii. 10, 11), "A man that is an heretic, after the first and second admonition, avoid; knowing that such an one is turned aside, and sinneth, being condemned by himself." For when he speaks of admonishing them, he signifies that he speaks not of such as had actually departed from the communion of the Church, but sheltered themselves under the common profession of Christians, doing every thing as they did, that by such means they might inveigle such as suspected nothing to admit their infusions, which was the fashion of the Gnostics, whose doctrines the Apostle (1 Peter, ii. 1) calls *αἰρέσεις ἀπωλείας*, "pestilent heresies;" and whom St. Paul must needs speak of in this place, because there were no other on foot so as to be mentioned by their writings. Such an one, then, the Apostle saith is condemned by himself, in the same sense as the councils and Church writers say of one in the same case, "in seipsum sententiam dixit"—he hath given sentence against himself; because, by refusing the second admonition, he hath declared himself obstinate in that which the common Christianity maketh inconsistent with the communion of the Church. And this is more proper to the circumstance of this text than St. Jerome's interpretation, of those that condemn themselves to be put out of the Church by voluntarily leaving the communion of it; though that also is not far from truth concerning them who are properly signified by the general name of heretics.

For it is very evident that when St. Paul saith (1 Cor. xi. 17), "There must be heresies among ye," his meaning is only of such factions as tended to schism, whereof he admonisheth them (1 Cor. i. 10), "That there be schisms amongst them." Now it is manifest how much difference there is between him who holdeth something contrary to the faith, and yet departeth not from the communion of the Church, and him that departeth from the communion of the Church, though holding nothing contrary to the substance of the Christian faith: the one (*often*) forfeiteth his interest in heaven, by the inward act of his soul refusing the common faith which saveth all Christians, though outwardly holding communion with the Church; the other, by

the inward act of the soul proceeding to the outward act of dissolving the communion of the Church, which the common charity of Christians in the first place is to maintain. If both these crimes may come under the common name of heresy (because inward misbelief naturally tendeth to make a sect of such as shall profess to live according to it), no marvel if all divisions of the Church be commonly called both heresies and schisms, whatsoever be the cause upon which they divide; if mere schisms (that is, where the cause is not anything necessary to the salvation of all to be believed) be also heresy in the language of the Apostles. Nevertheless, there being so much difference between the two crimes, and the grounds of them, it is necessary to understand, setting aside all equivocation of terms, that there is a crime consisting in misbelieving some article of the faith (which, if you please, may properly be called heresy); and another consisting in dissolving the unity of the Church, which is properly called schism when there is no further pretence for it than some law, which the Church being able to make, the other part will rather depart than admit. There may be divisions in the Church upon pretence of such doctrines as are not necessary to the salvation of all (and so no part of the rule of faith), but so evidently to be deduced from it, and from the rest of the Scriptures, that the Church may have cause to determine the same; and yet others may choose rather to depart from the Church than suffer the determination thereof to take place: which divisions that memorable observation of St. Jerome seems to call heresies, which said that all schisms naturally devise to themselves some heresy (that is, some doctrine extravagant from the doctrine of the Church), that they may seem not to have departed from the Church for nothing; which is very well exemplified by St. Austin, in the Donatists: but whether such divisions are to be counted heresies or schisms, both names properly signifying all divisions of the Church (and only that crime which consisteth in misbelieving some articles of faith, appropriating the name of heresy, because common use hath given it no peculiar name of its own), I leave to him that shall please to determine it.

Supposing these things, it will not be requisite for me to say much to that which hath been published concerning the nature of schism; that being to be had only out of the Scripture, it is no where there to be had but in St. Paul to the Corinthians; that there was at Corinth, when St. Paul writ, only one congregation of Christians, which he calleth the Church of Corinth; that therefore there is no crime of schism, but in breaking one congregation into more. As for any visible society of the Ca-

tholic Church acknowledging the materials (men that profess Christianity), and the form (which is that unity which is visible), he (*who thus argues*) is as great a stranger as if he had never heard of the creed; acknowledging, notwithstanding, an invisible unity in the common faith and love of Christians; upon persuasion whereof, he challenges as great freedom from schism as ever any member of the Catholic Church could claim. For having showed how a thing which God made visible for many ages may reasonably be expected to be found in the Scriptures, I am not to yield to try it by any part of them, knowing that whosoever evidenceth a society of the Church by God's law, evidenceth the crime that consists in the dissolving of it. And it were fit we were told how all the Christians, in a city where "God had much people," should sit at one table (or, at least, sup in one room), before we believe that there was then no more Christians at Corinth than could assemble at once; which, if I did believe, I would notwithstanding allege Justin the martyr's words (Apol.iii.), *καὶ τῇ τοῦ ἡλίου λεγομένη ἡμέρᾳ πάντων κατὰ πόλεις ἢ ἀγροὺς μενόντων ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συνέλευσις γίνεται*, "On the day called Sunday, all that dwelt in cities or in countries assemble themselves in one;" and supposing that then there were more Christians in Rome and the territory thereof, for example (for he writes to the Emperor Antoninus), than could meet together in one place; as Justin means not, when he says "that all in cities or countries meet in one, that all made one assembly, but met all in common assemblies;" I would thereupon argue, that no more does St. Paul say, when he gives these rules to the Corinthians (1 Cor. xi. 14), which serve any assembly, that there was then but one congregation at Corinth. If in Justin's time, if afore, if after, he can show me any Church of Rome, or any city besides Rome, that contained not all the Christians of that city and the territory thereof, I will believe that when Clemens writ the letter, lately published, from the Church of Rome to the Church of Corinth, there were no more Christians at Rome, or at Corinth, than could meet all at once: but if in all the Scripture, as well as in all records of the Church, a Church signify the university of Christians which one city and the territory thereof containeth, it is an affront to common sense for him to deny that *ἐκκλησία παροιკῆσα Ῥώμην*, or *Κόρινθον*, is the Church that is contained in the city and territory of Rome or Corinth.

NOTES.

It may be advisable to condense a part of Thorndike's argument, and to put it in somewhat plainer terms. He proves that the Church has *not* the power of the sword, by showing, first, that that power was previously lodged in other hands, and next, that our Lord did nothing to alter that previous arrangement; but as all temporal power is resolvable into the power of the sword, so the Church consequently possesses *no* temporal power: her members, of whatsoever rank and degree, are the subjects of the State, and her revenues precisely on the footing of any other private property. Thus far, in renouncing temporal power as the right of the Church, Thorndike may be said to agree with Erastus; but when he comes to state what the *right* of the Church is, we find him maintaining, with a skill equal to his candour, the independence and superiority of the Church, in things spiritual, with regard to the State. The right, then, which he claims for the Church, as one inherent in herself, which she owes to no human authority, and which, if need be, she is bound to exercise, even in despite of that authority, is "the right of holding assemblies." This term is a little one, and seems to imply little, but when we examine what it comprises, it will be found amply sufficient: for the right of holding assemblies means, a right to celebrate public worship, a right to administer the sacraments, a right to withhold admission to the one, and participation in the other, to all whom she judges unfit—in a word, the being the exclusive channel by which spiritual blessings are conveyed to the people; the power, in fact, of the keys. Now as this argument is intended to apply to *all* nations, it is necessary to make two premises—the one respecting its validity, the other its importance. The first premise, and which regards the validity of Thorndike's argument, is, that the Church spoken of is not any peculiar Church, or branch of the Church, as the Roman, the Greek, or the Anglican communion, but the Church *Catholic*, of which these all are branches; and this is necessary, in order to avoid the mixing up this question with another, *viz.*, the catholicity of any particular communion. Thus we do not argue here whether the Anglican Church is, or is not, the sole channel of spiritual blessings to the Anglican people, but whether the CHURCH CATHOLIC is the sole channel for such blessings to the world at large. Hence the Wesleyan, for instance, and the Dissenter, may safely coincide in the position, inasmuch as it does not touch upon the *ulterior question*, whether they are, or are not, portions of the Catholic Church. The next postulate regards the *importance* of the argument, and it is this—that there is a certain great advantage derivable from church-membership. For various reasons, we shall not attempt here to define what, and how great, this advantage is; we merely premise that such advantage does exist, and that it is very great. And here we shall have all sects agreeing with us, and evincing their agreement by their unanimous application to themselves of the term *catholic*, and their indignant repudiation of the charge of schism whenever it is brought against them. This is a tacit but sufficient acknowledgment that a very high value is set, by all who call themselves Christians, on membership of the Church Catholic. Thus much, then, being granted us, we next notice, that though the Church has *really* exercised temporal

power, she has generally avoided the *name* of exercising it; even when the inquisition had found individuals guilty of heresy, she handed them over to the secular arm, with a hypocritical prayer for gentleness and mercy towards them. The Popes themselves were generally careful to distinguish between what they did as *Popes*, and therefore heads of the Roman Church, and what they did as sovereign and independent princes. We proceed to show that the right claimed for the Church by Thorndike is amply sufficient to maintain her in her legitimate position. "She standeth upon the right of holding assemblies;" and this right she is bound to exercise, even if the temporal authorities should prohibit it. "Men (it has been observed) are subjects before they are Churchmen, and are bound to obey the secular before the ecclesiastical authority." But this proposition is true in one sense, and false in another. Doubtless, if in things indifferent the secular and ecclesiastical authority take opposite sides, men *are* bound to obey the former; but this has reference only to the living authorities of the *communion* under which they are placed. The claim of the Church Catholic is prior to *all* others, and may not be postponed to that of any earthly sovereign. If, then, it be granted that the claim of the Church be paramount where she does command, and the value of membership of the body Catholic be so great and so universally appreciated, it will follow that men, actuated by this belief, will resign all, rather than the privileges connected therewith. If the Bible be believed—and it is the right of the Church in a *Christian state* of which Thorndike speaks—so high a value will be set upon the sacraments, that to be denied them will be the severest of punishments; one which men, even though not vitally religious, will not willingly incur: hence the power of excommunication is given to the Church as the greatest stretch of authority she may make; and as the Jews put men to death for offences against *their* ritual, so the Church, not having the power of the sword, thrusts out from her pale those who offend against *hers*. The temporalities of the Church are guarded by the sword of the civil law; and though we hear of ecclesiastical law and ecclesiastical courts, still they are really rather civil courts, deciding causes connected with the temporalities of the Church.

It is quite true that the lax discipline of modern times, arising out of practical infidelity, has rendered the authority of the Church little more than nominal. Hundreds of thousands are living in a state of self-excommunication; and even granting the thousand and one communions which are to be found in this land, to be all portions of the one Catholic and Apostolic Church, it is yet evident, that though we may thereby make the number of Catholics greater, we do but increase the difficulties of enforcing any sufficient discipline. The theory of the Church which Thorndike propounds is, doubtless, the true one; but, in order to be practically available, it is necessary to ascertain, first, what communions are, and what are not, Catholic, and also to induce, by a strict discipline among Apostolic bodies, a more just idea of Church authority, and a higher value for the sacraments.

(a). *i. e.* Not under subjection to any foreign power.

(b). The Montanists were, as is well known, heretics, who sprung up about the year 171, in the reign of the Emperor Marcus Aurelius.

They were so called from their leader, Montanus, a Phrygian by birth, on which account they have sometimes been called Phrygians and Cataphrygians. It is said by many that Montanus embraced Christianity only with a view of attaining to ecclesiastical dignities. It is, however, quite certain, that not finding the way so open for him as he seems to have expected, he gave out that he was inspired, and that the Holy Ghost had revealed to him certain truths not made known to the Apostles. These points had regard chiefly to discipline, which he made very austere, and refused to communicate with those whose habits he considered too indulgent. Thus it appears—and most important is it to mark this—that Montanus began with a schism even before a council had declared him guilty of heresy. Two ladies of rank and influence, and whom the ecclesiastical historians declare to have been more remarkable for zeal than virtue, named Priscilla and Maximilla, joined themselves to his society, and in a short time he had many followers. The slur cast upon the characters of Priscilla and Maximilla seems to be difficult to account for. It is hardly to be expected that persons of vicious conversation would join themselves to the most severe and ascetic of sects, unless, indeed, they were truly penitent, and then the implied sneer falls at once to the ground. Shortly after this, a council of the Bishops of Asia was assembled, which condemned the opinions of Montanus, and excommunicated his followers. This example was soon followed by the Western Churches; and the Montanists then set themselves up in opposition to the authority of the Church Catholic, and formed a sect, at the head of which were the heresiarch himself and the two women of whom mention has already been made. The tenets of the sect thus established were austere in the extreme: they refused communion with notorious offenders, and held that the bishops had no power to reconcile them to the Church; they held it unlawful to fly in times of persecution, condemned second marriage, and allowed the dissolution of such as were already contracted; they observed also three Lents. With regard to Montanus himself, they merely declared that the Holy Spirit had particularly enlightened him, and that he was not inspired like the Apostles. Of the eminent men who joined themselves to this sect, the most remarkable was Tertullian.—*Eusebius Hist. Eccl., Lib. 5; Epiphanius, Hær. 48 and 51.*

(c). A most important statement, but to be understood with due limitations.

(d). The comparison is between the Church, founded *immediately* by God, and the State, founded *mediately* by his Providence.

(e). The question of endowments is one which, though much has been written on both sides, is not one of much difficulty. Thorndike, in this passage, does not speak of *building*, but of *founding* Churches; and hence, though the passage has been triumphantly quoted in favour of the voluntary system, it makes, in reality, nothing for it. It is a necessary consequence, that in times of difficulty and persecution, each Church should be anxious to have within itself all the elements of ecclesiastical order. Hence we find, that in order to render the Churches as much as possible independent of external assistance, the order of Bishops was multiplied to a great extent, and the number of Churches continually increased; all, however, dependent upon the

metropolitan or patriarchal see. When, however, the times of persecution passed away, and a freer intercourse took place between the Churches in the different cities, it became no longer a matter of necessity to increase the number of bishops, but rather that of presbyters. The bishops, confining themselves to the peculiar duties of their office, were able to preside over *many* congregations; and intercourse between those congregations being unrestrained, the Church sought rather the aid of pastors to superintend the spiritual welfare of single villages, towns, or portions of towns. Hence, though it be perfectly true that a greater number of Churches were founded in times of persecution, yet those Churches were smaller in their extent, and more limited in the number of their members, than those which afterwards arose. But when, in addition to peace, the Church also enjoyed wealth, we are naturally led to expect again a new order of things will be observed with regard to the foundation both of congregations and of *Churches*, properly so called. And first as to the endowment of congregations, or of pastors for single congregations: it soon became the custom in the Church to have many presbyters attached to the service of one building; and this for obvious reasons: the large size of some of the early Christian Churches, and the splendour with which divine service was celebrated, rendered it absolutely necessary that such should be the case; and thus a great number of presbyters frequently attached to one Church had the spiritual oversight of a large number of persons worshipping there. It will hence appear a necessary consequence of rich endowments, that the number even of congregations should be diminished, while their magnitude was proportionably increased. With regard to Diocesan Churches, the same rule will be found to prevail; and another cause also contributed to render them fewer and larger, which was the wealth, patronage, and court favour heaped upon the prelates. The present is not the place to enquire whether the sudden change from a state sometimes of severe persecution, and at all times of great insecurity, to power, riches, and splendour, was one which tended to the spiritual improvement of the Church; but we have to show that the natural tendency of such a state of things was to exalt the dignity and diminish the number of the bishops. Wealth, power, and court favour, even though bestowed by the hand of a Roman Emperor, have their natural limits; and while it was to be expected that those prelates who were about the person of the sovereign would receive *imperial* marks of his favour and friendship, it was also necessary not to induce too great a difference among the chief pastors of the Church. It was a sound principle, and generally understood, that the office and not the person of Christ's ministers was to be the object of respect: hence, though personal regard might raise some prelates to wealth and worldly power, the principle of which we have spoken raised the rest to something like an equality, at least, as far as this was practicable. And thus the natural limits of these advantages operated in diminishing the number of diocesan bishops; while the peace which the Church enjoyed enabled them, without inconvenience, to preside over more extensive dioceses.

CHAPTER II.

FAITH IN THE ATONEMENT.



SECTION 1. *Tyndale on Justification by Faith.*

SECTION 2. *Bilson on Christ's Sufferings.*

PREFACE.

AMONG the first and most prominent doctrines of the Anglican Church, stands that of Justification by Faith ; yet, while this is allowed by all, there are so many ways of interpreting the term, so many modes of viewing the doctrine, that even yet there are disputes as to what the true opinion of the Church on this most important topic really is. When our Reformers rejected the Romish doctrine of Grace of *congruity*, followed by Grace of *condignity*, they did so wholly and without hesitation. They did not merely modify the Tridentine dogma, and accept it under a new aspect and with fresh limitations, but they admitted in its stead a doctrine totally inconsistent therewith—a doctrine which, however, is taught in Scripture, and has been maintained in the Church Catholic from the times of the Roman Clement even to the present day. This doctrine is the Justification of Man by Faith in Christ, not as the *meritorious*, but simply as the *instrumental* cause of that justification.

This doctrine is opposed to three forms of error : first, that which declares that we are justified by the *works* of faith ; secondly, that which predicates that we are justified by the *merit* of faith ; and thirdly, that which pronounces that we are justified by a faith without works.

That there are three causes of our justification—the originating cause, which is the boundless love of God ; the meritorious cause, which is the obedience, active and passive, of the Saviour ; and the instrumental cause, which is the faith of which we speak—is now and ever has been the expressed, in various ways, doctrine of our Church. And first, as to the originating cause, concerning which there has been no question among either Romanists or Anglicans at any time. The boundless mercy of God exhibited towards man in his frail and fallen state, and

more especially made manifest in the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ, is a topic upon which all who bear the Christian name have ever delighted to dwell.

The meritorious cause of justification has, however, been less universally received ; and even where received, variously understood. Few members of the Anglican Church have refused, in plain terms, to acknowledge the doctrine, that the obedience, active and passive, of the Saviour is *a* meritorious cause of our justification ; but not a few have been desirous to attach some merit to works performed with a view to the glory of God. The chief cause of this desire has, doubtless, been an anxiety to avoid the error of the Solifidians—those, viz., who declare that the obedience of the Saviour is *in such wise* meritorious, and faith in that merit in such wise instrumental, that good works on the part of the believer are unnecessary. These persons support their opinion by the instance of the thief on the cross. They observe that his works were all evil, and that he was saved by faith without works—that is, without good works. On this, as the strongest, nay, the *only* instance which can be produced apparently in favour of the Solifidian doctrine, we shall make a few remarks. First, then, the *works* of the crucified malefactor after his conversion were good, though necessarily they were but few. We hear only of one sentence which he spoke, but that one indicated faith, hope, humility, and reverence. Next, that the verdict of the Lord, in his case, *proved* these virtues to be possessed, and not merely assumed ; and hence we may fairly argue, that had he been released from the cross, and permitted to live, they would have been exemplified in his future life;—but as by faith he was justified, so we know that his faith was genuine, though displayed so late. On the other hand, no *man* can see the heart of his fellow-man ; and *our* only mode, therefore, of judging whether faith be genuine or not is by works, and even this is but a negative proof. If an individual declare that he is the subject of saving faith, and lead at the same time an ungodly life, then we know that his declaration is untrue ; but, on the other hand, if, making this assertion, he lead a life outwardly consistent, we cannot *therefore* pronounce that his faith is what he declares it to be. St.

James has assured us that faith without works is dead. Now let us look at the Articles:—

“We are accounted righteous before God only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ by faith, and not for our own works or deservings. Wherefore, that we are justified by faith only is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort; as more largely is expressed in the Homily of Justification.”

The Council of Trent, on the other hand, declares that our good works are truly meritorious; that there is in us, through baptism, an implanted and inherent righteousness, which of itself is merit, and that its fruits are truly meritorious in attaining eternal life—“*ad vitam eternam consequendam vere promereri.*” Dr. Nicholls observes, that “this doctrine, as it is one of the most arrogant and scandalous of the corruptions of modern Rome, so is it one of the most modern, having never been generally received even in that Church itself before the date of the Tridentine Council.” Here, then, our Church opposes the Romanist: nor less does she oppose those who insist on a justification by the *merit* of faith. “It should be noticed (remarks Archdeacon Welchman), that we are justified by faith, not because of faith, for there is no more merit in our faith than in our works.” “Faith (says another eminent writer) is to the soul what the hand is to the body: it lays hold on Christ for salvation, but merits nothing.”

Lastly, our Church opposes the Solifidians, who deny the necessity of good works: for though there was no Article on this subject in 1552, yet when the Antinomian heresy began to prevail, an Article was added (1562) to the following effect:—

“Albeit that good works, which are the fruits of faith, and follow after justification, cannot put away our sins, and endure the severity of God’s judgment; yet are they pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ, and do spring out necessarily of a true and lively faith; insomuch that by them a lively faith may be as evidently known as a tree discerned by the fruit.”

And here, too, we will say a few words about what has sometimes been called Baptismal Justification. Justification by Faith, and by Faith alone, is the doctrine of the Church; yet

the term is used in a rather loose sense: and if we consider the original meaning of the word, we shall see that there is such a thing as baptismal justification. For if it be granted, that “without holiness no one can see the Lord”—that no human being can be holy who is not justified—then it follows, that without *justification* no one can see the Lord. Let it again be granted, that we are not *born* in a justified state, but that infants being baptized, and dying during their infancy, are certainly saved: the conclusion must be, that such infants are justified. Now as these infants have no *actual* sin to answer for, all from which they require justification is the *original* sin, the guilt of which they derive from Adam. And this *guilt* is, we are taught, remitted in baptism, though, alas! the corruption of nature remains. Hence, then, there is a view under which we may safely hold the doctrine of baptismal justification; and the error of those who do hold it, seems to be a confusion of baptismal justification with justification by faith, or, perhaps, a confusion of justification and regeneration. We have been told that the Church did never admit but *one* justification. This is not true: she admits but one regeneration, but she nowhere similarly limits justification.

It may not be unprofitable here to pause for a moment, and consider in what way this limitation in the one case, and this non-limitation in the other, is to be understood. Regeneration is duplex in its character, and consists, first, in a federal regeneration, which is invariably conferred in baptism, and is associated with the remission of the guilt of original sin: the two graces thus constituting actual and entire justification in the case of the infant recipient. But, secondly, there is also a moral and spiritual regeneration, which is *not* invariably conferred in baptism. Now, in order to salvation, the *adult* must be partaker of both these; and therefore, though the Church declares that he is *regenerate* if he be baptized, she alludes only to the federal regeneration, which (when we say that regeneration cannot be repeated) constitutes only a *part*, and not the *whole* of the grace.

Justification again is, first, from original sin, which is obtained by baptism, and *cannot* therefore be repeated; and from actual

sin, which may and must be repeated as often as a believer sins. The adult Christian has, therefore, evidently need of both, as of both parts of regeneration.

Having said thus much concerning the doctrines of which the present Tracts contain a summary, we must now say somewhat of the reasons of our choice in presenting the reader with productions from the pens of William Tyndale and Bishop Bilson. The progress of the Reformation is well known to have been gradual; many doctrines were taught, or rather left uncontradicted, in its earlier period, which were expressly denounced before its close. Variations occur in the Articles, which were prepared to suit the heresies prevailing in that day, and of which we have already given an example in the twelfth. But the spring of the Reformation is not to be sought, as Romanists falsely and unphilosophically declare, in the selfish passions of Henry VIII. He could not, powerful and popular as he was, have carried with him the nation, had they not been previously prepared for the transition—had they not, indeed, been for a long time before in a state of transition. Among the earliest of our English Reformers was William Tyndale, presbyter and martyr, canon of Christ Church, Oxford, at its foundation, and subsequently a member of the University of Cambridge. In his early life he was so attached to the opinions of Luther, and so convinced of their importance as well as of their truth, that he employed himself in propagating them at Oxford, and is said to have made converts among the fellows of Magdalen College. His activity, both at the University and elsewhere, soon drew on him the unfavourable notice of his ecclesiastical superiors, and he was threatened with the usual penalties of heresy. This probably prevented the amiable Cuthbert Tunstall from receiving him as a chaplain, an office which Tyndale greatly desired. Humphrey Monmouth, a man of large fortune and an alderman of London, now became the patron of Tyndale, who visited Germany, and had many interviews with the Saxon Reformers. He immediately set about a translation of the Scriptures, of which the New Testament was soon completed. The whole edition was immediately, as far as possible, bought up and destroyed by Warham and Tunstall.

The latter, however, liberally furnished Tyndale with money for his subsistence abroad. The appearance of the New Testament in English excited great commotion, and its effects may be well measured by the means taken by such men as Warham and Tunstall to suppress it. Tyndale suffered martyrdom at Antwerp in the year 1536. The historical connection of this good and learned man with the Church of England is remarkable. His translation,* with but few alterations, and those of no moment, was permitted by Henry VIII. to be used in 1537, and is that which is commonly called "Matthew's Bible." This was done at the express and earnest solicitation of Cranmer.

The next Tract is by Bishop Bilson, one of the most eminent prelates of Elizabeth's reign, successively Bishop of Worcester and Winchester, and one of the speakers at the Hampton Court Conference in 1603-4. Fuller states that he there spoke much and learnedly, and "was one of the chief maintainers and supporters of the Church of England." To him, also, together with Dr. Miles Smith, afterwards Bishop of Gloucester, was committed the care of revising and correcting the present authorized version of the Scriptures. He was much commended by the Queen and by Archbishop Whitgift, and at their request published more than one doctrinal work.

Some writers, though it is difficult to say on what grounds, have deemed fit to say that Bishop Bilson's writings are not *now* thought consonant to the doctrines of the Church of England. All that an assertion like this deserves is, that if they were consonant to these doctrines in 1597, doubtless they are consonant now, unless it can be shown that the old articles have been repealed and new ones published.

C.

CAMBRIDGE,

The Feast of St. Paul's Conversion, 1841.

* Wanley considers Tyndale to have translated the Old Testament down to the Book of Chronicles, and the whole of the New Testament.

JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH.

BY WILLIAM TYNDALE,

SOME TIME CANON OF CHRIST CHURCH, PRESBYTER, AND MARTYR.

(Reprinted from the Works of Tyndale; Edition of 1573).

“And he is the satisfaction for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for all the world’s.”

THAT I call satisfaction, the Greek calleth *Ilasmus*, and the Hebrew *Copar*: and it is first taken for the assuaging of wounds, sores, and swellings, and the taking away of pain and smart of them; and thence is borrowed for the pacifying and assuaging of wrath and anger, and for an amends making, a contenting, satisfaction, a ransom, and making at one, as it is to see abundantly in the Bible. So that Christ is a full contenting, satisfaction, and ransom for our sins; and not for ours only which are apostles and disciples of Christ while he was yet here; or for ours which are Jews or Israelites, and the seed of Abraham; or for ours that now believe at this present time; but for all men’s sins, both for their sins which went before and believed the promises to come, and for ours which have seen them fulfilled, and also for all them which shall afterward believe unto the world’s end, of whatsoever nation or degree they be. For Paul commandeth (1 Tim. ii.) to pray for all men and all degrees, saying *that* to be acceptable unto our Saviour God, which will have all men saved and come to the knowledge of the truth, that is, some of all nations and all degrees, and not the Jews only: “for (saith he) there is one God, and one Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus, which gave himself a redemption and full satisfaction for all men.”

Let this, therefore, be an undoubted article of thy faith; not of an history faith, as thou believest a deed of Alexander, or of the old Romans; but of a lively faith and belief, to put thy

trust and confidence in, and to buy and sell thereon, as we say, and to have thy sins taken away, and thy soul saved thereby, if thou hold it fast; and to continue ever in sin, and to have thy soul damned, if thou let it slip: that our Jesus, our Saviour that saveth his people from their sins, and our Christ, that is our King over all sin, death, and hell, anointed with fulness of all grace and with the Spirit of God, to distribute unto all men, hath, according unto the Epistle to the Hebrews, and all the Scripture, in the days of his mortal flesh, with fasting, praying, suffering, and crying to God mightily for us, and with shedding his blood, made full satisfaction, both, "*â poena et â culpa*" (*with our holy father's leave**), for all the sins of the world, both of theirs that went before and of theirs that come after in the faith, whether it be original sin or actual; and not only the sins committed with consent to evil in time of ignorance before the knowledge of the truth, but also the sins done of frailty after we have forsaken evil and consented to the laws of God in our hearts, promising to follow Christ and walk in the light of his doctrine.

"He saveth his people from their sins" (Matt. i.), and that he only: "so that there is no other name to be saved by," (Acts iv.) "And unto him bear all the prophets record, that all that believe in him shall receive remission of their sins in his name," (Acts x.) "And by him only we have an entering in unto the Father, and unto all grace," (Ephes. ii. 3, and Rom. v.) "And as many as come before him are thieves and murderers," (John x.); that is, whosoever preacheth any other forgiveness of sin than through faith in his name, the same slayeth the soul.

This to be true, not only of original but of actual, and as well of that we commit after our profession as before, mayest thou evidently see by the ensamples of the Scripture. Christ forgave the woman taken in adultery (John viii.), and another whom he healed (John v.); and he forgave publicans and open sinners, and put none to *do* penance, as they call it, for to make satisfaction for sin, which he forgave through repentance and faith, but enjoined them the *life of* penance, the profession of their baptism, to tame the flesh in keeping the commandments, and that they should sin no more. And those sinners were for the most part Jews, and had their original sin forgiven them before, through faith in the testament of God. Christ forgave his Apostles their actual sins, after their profession, which

* Tyndale, in this and similar passages, speaks ironically of the Pope; the doctrine of justification by faith being very loosely held in the Church of Rome, and some years afterwards denied, or at least evaded, at the Council of Trent.

they committed in denying him, and put none to do penance for satisfaction. Peter (Acts ii.) absolveth the Jews through repentance and faith from their actual sins which they did in consenting unto Christ's death, and enjoined them no penance to make satisfaction. Paul also had his actual sins forgiven him freely through repentance and faith, without mention of satisfaction (Acts ix.) So that according unto this present text of John, "If it chance us to sin of frailty, let us not despair, for we have an advocate and intercessor, a true attorney,* with the Father, Jesus Christ, righteous toward God and man, and is the reconciling and satisfaction for our sins."

For Christ's works are perfect, so that he hath obtained us all mercy, and hath set us in the full state of grace and favour of God, and hath made us as well-beloved as the angels of heaven, though we be yet weak; as the young children, though they can do no good at all, are yet as tenderly beloved as the old. And God, for Christ's sake, hath promised that whatsoever evil we shall do, yet if we turn and repent he will never more think on our sins.

Thou wilt say, God forgiveth the displeasure, but we must suffer pain to satisfy the righteousness of God. And then God hath a righteousness which may not forgive pain and all, that the poor sinner should go scot free without aught at all. God was unrighteous to forgive the thief his pain and all, through repentance and faith, unto whom, for lack of leisure, was no penance enjoined. And my faith is, that whatsoever example of mercy God hath shewed one, that same he hath promised all; yea, will he peradventure forgive me, but I must make amends. If I owe you twenty pounds, ye will forgive me; that is, ye will no more be angry with me, but I shall pay you the twenty pounds. O, Popish forgiveness, with whom it goeth after the common proverb, "no penny, no pardon." His fatherhood † giveth pardon freely, but we must pay money abundantly.

Paul's doctrine is (Rom. ix.), "If a man work, it ought not to be said that his hire was given him of grace or favour, but of duty; but to him that worketh not, but believeth in him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith (he saith not his works, although he commandeth us diligently to work, and despiseth none that God commandeth), his faith (saith he) is reckoned him for his righteousness:" confirming his saying with the testimony of the prophet David in the thirty-second Psalm, saying, "Blessed is the man unto whom God imputeth or reckoneth not his sin;"

* This expression may seem extraordinary in our day; but the meaning is simply a mediator between the criminal and the law.

† The Pope.

that is to say, which man, although he be a sinner, yet God layeth not it to his charge for his faith's sake. And in the eleventh chapter he saith, "If it come of grace, then it cometh not of works; for then were grace no grace," saith he. For it was a very strange speaking in Paul's ears to call that grace that came of deserving of works; or that deserving of works which came by grace: for he reckoned works and grace to be contrary in such manner of speech. But our holy father hath coupled them together of pure liberality, I dare say, and not for covetousness. For as his holiness, if he have a cause against any man, immediately breatheth out an excommunication upon him, and will have satisfaction for the uttermost farthing, and somewhat above, to teach them to beware against another time, yea, he will bless again from the terrible sentence of his heavy curse; even so of that blessed complexion he describeth the nature of the mercy of God, that God will remit his anger to us upon the appointment of our satisfaction: when the Scripture saith Christ is our righteousness, our justifying, our redemption, our atonement, that hath appeased God, and cleanseth us from our sins, and all in his blood; so that his blood is the satisfaction only.

And that thou mayest the better perceive the falsehood of our holy father's fleshly imagination, call to mind how that the Scripture saith (John iv.), "God is a Spirit, and must be worshipped in the spirit;" that is, repentance, faith, hope, and love toward his law and our neighbour for his sake, is his worship in the spirit. And, therefore, whosoever worshippeth God with works, and referreth his works to God to be a sacrifice unto him, to appease him, as though he delighted in the work for the work's sake, the same maketh of God an image or idol, and is an image-server, and as wicked an idolator as ever was any blind heathen, and serveth God after the imagination of his own heart, and is abominable unto God; as thou seest in how many places God defieth the sacrifice of the children of Israel for the said imagination. So that whosoever supposeth that his candle sticking before an image, his putting a penny in the box, his going a pilgrimage, his fasting, his going softly, barefoot going, his crouching, kneeling, and pain-taking, be sacrifice unto God, as though he delighted in them, as we in the gestures of Jack Napes—is as blind as he that gropeth for his way at noon. God's worship is to love him for his mercy, and of love to bestow all our works upon our neighbour for his sake, and upon the taming of our flesh that we sin not again, which should be the chiefest care of a Christian man, while Christ careth for that that is once past and committed already, whether

before our profession or after. For the conditions of the peace that is made between God and us in Christ's blood are these: the law is set before us, unto which, if we consent and submit ourselves to be scholars thereof, then are not only all our fore sins forgiven, both "*pœna et culpa*" (with our holy father's license ever), but also all our infirmities, weakness, proneness, readiness, and motions unto sin are pardoned and taken away, and we translated from under the damnation of the law, which damneth as well those infirmities as the sin that springeth of them, and putteth us under grace (Rom. vii.) So that we shall not henceforth, as long as we forsake not our profession, be judged by the rigorousness of the law; but chastised if we do amiss as children that are under no law. Now, then, if God in Christ pardon our infirmities, by reason of which we cannot escape, but that we shall now and then sin, it followeth that he must likewise pardon the actual sin which we do compelled of those infirmities, in spite of our hearts and against the will of the spirit. For if thou pardon the sickness of the sick, then must thou pardon the deeds which he doth, or leaveth undone, by the reason of his sickness. If the madness of a madman be pardoned, and under no law, then if he murder in his madness, he may not be slain again. If children within a certain age are not under the law that slayeth thieves, then can ye not of right hang them, though they steal. What Popish pardoning were that? Thus doth Paul (Rom. vii.) so confirm that all the world cannot quibble against it, saying, "I consent unto the law of God that it is good, and fain would I do it; and yet have I not always power so to do, but find another thing in my flesh rebelling against the will of my mind, and leading me captive into sin; so that I cannot do that I would do, but am compelled to do that I would not. If (saith he) I do that I would not, then I do it not, but the sin that dwelleth in me doth it;" and then saith he, "Who shall deliver me from this body of death, in which I am bound prisoner against my will? Thanks be to God (saith he), through Jesus Christ our Lord, which hath conquered and overcome sin, death, and hell, and hath put the damnation of the law out of the way, unto all that profess the law and believe in him."

We be under the law to learn it, and to fashion our deeds as like as we can, but not under the damnation of the law, that we should be damned though our deeds were not perfect as the law requireth, or though of frailty we at a time break it; as children are under the law that they steal not, but not under the damnation though they steal. So that all they that are grafted into Christ to follow his doctrine are under the law to

learn it only, but are delivered from fear of everlasting death and hell, and all the threatenings of the law, and from conscience of sin, which seared us from God; and we are come unto God though the confidence that we have in Jesus Christ, and are as familiar and bold with him as young innocent children, which have no conscience of sin, are with their fathers and mothers, or them that nourish them; which were impossible if God now (as the Pope painteth him) did shake a rod at us of seven years' punishment, as sharp as the pains of hell, for every trespass we do, which trespass, for the number of them, were like to make our purgatory almost as long as hell, seeing we have no God's word that we should be delivered thence until we have paid the last farthing; and therefore could our conscience never be at rest, nor be bold and familiar with God.

If ye say the Pope can deliver my conscience from fear of purgatory (as his poetry* only putteth me in fear), and that by this text, "Whatsoever thou bindest on earth," &c.; if thou this way understand the text, whatsoever thou, being on earth, loosest anywhere; then might he loose in hell and bind in heaven. But why may not I take the text of Christ (John xvi.), "Whatsoever ye ask my Father, in my name, he will give it you," and desire forgiveness of all together, in Christ's name, both "a poena et culpa," and there remaineth no such purgatory at all? Howbeit, the text of binding and loosing is but borrowed speech, how that after the similitude of worldly binding and loosing, locking and unlocking, the word of God, truly preached, doth bind and loose the conscience.†

God saith to Jeremiah (chap. i.), "Behold, I give thee power over nations and kingdoms, to pluck up by the roots, and to shiver in pieces, to destroy and cast down, and to build and plant." How did he destroy nations and kingdoms, and how did he build them? Verily, by preaching and prophecyng. What nation, kingdom, or city he prophecied to be overthrown, was so; and what city he prophecied to be built again, was so; and what nation, after they were brought into captivity, he prophecied to be restored again, were so; and whom he prophecied to perish, perished; and whom he prophecied to be saved, was saved.

Even so, whomsoever a true preacher of God's word saith shall be damned for his sin, because he will not repent and be-

* Invention.

† It will be seen, from the remainder of this argument, that Tyndale's doctrine did not differ from that of the Church when the Reformation was completed, either in the nature of absolution, or in the qualifications of those who should administer it. By a *true preacher*, he evidently means one *apostolically called*.

lieve in Christ, the same is damned; and whomsoever a true preacher of God's word saith shall be saved, because he repenteth and believeth in Christ's blood, the same is saved. And this is the binding and loosing that Christ meant.

Notwithstanding, ye must understand that when we have sinned, though our hearts were not to sin, and though we repent ere the deed be done, yet the body, in sinning, hath overcome the spirit and hath got the mastery: so that the spirit is now weaker and feebler to virtue, and to follow the law of God and doctrine of Christ, and the flesh stronger to follow vice and sin. Wherefore as when an old sore is broken forth again, we begin, as it were, a new cure with greater diligence and more care than before; even so here we must renew our old battle against the flesh, and more strongly go to work to subdue it and to quench the lusts thereof, which are waxen so rank that they bud out openly, according to the profession of our baptism, which is the very sacrament or sign of repentance; or, if they will so have it called, penance, by the interpretation of Paul (Rom. vi.): for the plunging into the water, as it betokeneth, on the one part, that Christ hath washed our souls in his blood; even so, on the other part, it signifieth that we have promised to quench and slay the lusts of the flesh, with prayer, fasting, and holy meditation, after the doctrine of Christ, and with all godly exercise that tame the flesh and kill not the man.

Whereupon the bishops that succeeded the apostles, when men had done any open sins, enjoined them penance, as they call it, by the authority* of the congregation and governors thereof, and advice of the most wise and discreet, and with the willing consent of the trespassers, to tame the flesh, as to go softly, to wear shirts of hair, to go barefoot and barehead, to pray, to fast bread and water, some once in the week, some twice, or all the week, a whole year, two years, three years, seven years, twenty years, and some all their lives long; and to go in pilgrimage to visit the memorials of saints, to strengthen them the better to follow the ensample, and such like; and all to slay the worldly mind of the flesh: which manner, when it was once received of the people by custom, it became a law; and the bishops by little and little gat it whole into their own hands.

When the bishops saw that how they had got the simple people under them in such humble obedience, they began to

* By the authority of the congregation; *i. e.*, not that the congregation either enjoined or nominated the penance, but simply, by withholding their countenance till it was performed, gave practical *efficacy* to the episcopal authority.

set up their crests, and to reign over them as princes, and to enjoin sore penance for small trifles, namely, if ought were done against their pleasure, and beat some sore, and spared other, and sold their penance to the rich, and overladed the poor, until the tyranny was waxed so grievous that the people would bear it no longer.* For by this time, what with the multitude of ceremonies and heap of men's constitutions, whose right use was thereto clean forgotten, and partly because our shepherds were busied to seek themselves and their high authority, and exalted every man his throne, and were become wolves unto the flock, the cause why the people were disobedient unto wholesome counsel; the word of God was sore darkened, and no where purely preached. And therefore the prelates, loth to lose their high authority and to let the people go free of their yoke, began to turn their tale, and sing a new song, how that this penance was enjoined to make satisfaction to God for the sin that was committed, robbing our souls of the fruits of Christ's blood, and making us image-servants, referring our deeds unto the person of God, and worshipping him as an image of our own imagination with bodily work; saying, moreover, if we would not do such penance here at their injunctions, we must do it in another world; and so feigned purgatory, where we must suffer seven years for every sin. And when the kingdom of Antichrist was so enlarged that it must have an head, they set up our holy father of Rome, or rather usurped that Rome with violence, and to him was given this prerogative, to sell whom he would from purgatory.

And the sacrament of penance they thus describe: contrition, confession, and satisfaction. Contrition, sorrow for thy sins; confession, not to God and them whom thou hast offended, but tell thy sins in the priest's ear; satisfaction, to do certain deeds enjoined of them, to buy out thy sins. And in their description they have clean excluded the faith in the satisfaction of Christ's blood, which only bringeth life, and the spirit of life, and righteousness, and without the which it is impossible to please God (Heb. xi.): in whose stead they have put in the presumption of our own works. And for lack of trust in Christ's blood, our contrition (a) is but a fruitless sorrow in the respect of hell, which maketh us hate the law still, and consequently God that made it; whereas true contrition annexed with faith, is sorrow in respect of the law, unto which we consent that it is good, and love it, and therefore mourn, partly because we have

* A picture but too true of the manner in which the corruptions of *Popery* crept into the before pure *Apostolic Church*.

offended it, and partly because we lack power to fulfil it as we would.

These things to be true our prelates know, by open histories, as well as when it is noon the sun is flat south; but it delighteth them to resist the Holy Ghost, and to persecute the preachers of the things, which, if they as well loved as they know to be true, they would preach the same themselves, and live thereafter. Hereof ye may see our works are but to tame the flesh only, and can be no satisfaction to God, except we make him an image and ourselves image-servants. And hereof ye may see how, out of this open penance, came the ear confession, satisfaction of works, purgatory, and pardons. For when they had put the satisfaction of Christ's blood out of the way, then as they compelled to confess open sins and to take open penance, even so they compelled to confess secret sins and to take secret penance; and as they made merchandize of open penance, so did they of secret. And for them that would not receive such pardon, feigned they purgatory; and for them that received them, feigned they pardon, turning binding and loosing with preaching God's word, into buying and selling sin for money. And since that time hitherto, the worse the people were, the better were the prelates content, ever resisting that they should be made better through their covetousness and proud desire of honour.

And out of this false presumption of works, sprang the wicked vows of religion which they vow to make satisfaction for sin, and to be higher in heaven, instead of the life of penance which Christ taught us in the Gospel, to tame the flesh and to crucify the members withal, that we henceforth should walk in the ways of God's law, and sin no more. (b)

And to speak of worshipping of saints, and praying unto them, and of that we make them our advocates well nigh above Christ, or altogether, though it require a long disputation, yet it is as bright as the day to all that know the truth, how that our fasting of their evens and keeping their holy days, going barefoot, sticking up of candles in the bright day in the worshipping of them to obtain their favour, our giving them so costly jewels, offering into their boxes, clothing their images, shoeing them with silver shoes with an ounce of crystal in the middle, to stroke the lips and eyes of the ignorant as a man would stroke young children's heads to entice them and bring them in, and rock them asleep in ignorance, are, with all like service, plain idolatry, that is, in English, image-service: for the saints are spirits, and can have no delectation in bodily things. And because those bodily deeds can be no service unto

the spiritual saints, and we do them not to be a service to ourselves or our neighbours, we serve the work and the false imagination of our fleshly wit, after the doctrine of man, and not of God, and are image-servants. And this is it that Paul calleth "*Servire elementis mundi*;" to be in captivity under empty ceremonies and vain traditions of men's doctrine, and to do the work for the work itself, as though God delighted therein, for the deed itself, without all other respect.

But and ye will know the true worshipping of saints, hearken unto Paul, Phil. ii., where he saith, "Ye shine as lights in the world, holding fast the word of life unto my glory or worship against the day of Jesus Christ, that I have not run nor laboured in vain." That is, to wear the worship which all true saints now seek, and the worship that all the true messengers of God seek this day, or ever shall seek, is to draw all to Christ with preaching the true word of God, and with the example of pure living fashioned thereafter. Will ye, therefore, worship saints truly? Then hear what they preached, and believe their doctrine; and as they followed that doctrine, so conform your living like unto theirs: and that shall be unto their high worship in the coming again of Christ (when all men's deeds shall appear, and every man shall be judged and receive his reward according unto his deeds), how that they, not only while they here lived, but also after their death, with the example of their doctrine and living left behind, in writing and other memorials, unto the example of them that should follow them unto Christ that were born five hundred, yea, a thousand years after their death. This was their worship in the spirit at the beginning, as they were spirits, and lights were stuck before their memorials at the beginning to be a ceremony to put us in remembrance that we so praised the saints and boasted their livings that we followed their examples in our deeds, as Christ saith (Matt v.), "Let your light so shine before men that they see your good works, and glorify your Father that is in heaven." For preaching of the doctrine which is light hath but small effect to move the heart, if the example of living do disagree.

And that we worship saints for fear lest they should be displeased and angry with us, and plague us or hurt us (as who is not afraid of St. Laurence?—who dare deny St. Anthony a fleece of wool, for fear of his terrible fire, or lest he send a plague among our sheep?) is heathen image-service, and clean against the first commandment, which is, "Hear, Israel: the Lord thy God is one God." Now God in the Hebrew is called "El," or "Elohim" in the plural number—strength or might. So that the commandment is, "Hear, Israel: he that is thy

power and might, thy sword and shield, is but one;" that is, there is none of might to help or hurt thee save one, which is altogether thine and at thy commandment, if thou wilt hear his voice. And all other might in the world is borrowed of him, and he will lend no might against the contrary to his promises: keep, therefore, his commandments, and he shall keep thee. And if thou have broken them, and he have lent of his power against thee, repent and come again unto thy profession, and he will return again unto his mercy, and fetch his power home again which he lent to vex thee, because thou forsookest him and brakest his commandments; and fear no other creature, for false fear is the cause of all idolatry.

Moreover, all we that are baptized in Christ have professed to do good for evil, and not to avenge ourselves; and many of us come unto such perfection that we can be provoked by no temptation to desire vengeance, but have compassion, and meekly pray for them that slay us.

How wicked a thing, then, is it to think that the saints plague us, because we do them not such superstitious honour, which is their dishonour and our shame. It is, verily, a Popish imagination, and even to describe the saints after the nature of our prelates, which be meek and lowly till they be where they would be. But when they be once aloft, they play the tormentors, if we will not honour them and do whatsoever they command, more earnestly than that which God himself hath commanded, and fear them above God himself.

And it can be but like abomination also that we choose, of a fleshly mind, every man his several saint, or rather several god, to be our advocates, attorneys, mediators (when there is but one, 1 Tim. ii.), and intercessors, and call them our advocates, when we might better call them our adulterers, and serve them, or rather a painted post in their stead, with our image-service, therewith to bind them for to help us whensoever and for whatsoever we call unto them, and to save our souls thereto with their prayers and merits; and will yet neither hear the doctrine or follow the example of living, which is their only honour, in the spirit of any saint whose doctrine and living is authentic.

For first, God, which alone hath power to hurt or help, hath made appointment betwixt him and us in Christ's blood, and hath bound himself to give us whatsoever we ask in his name, testifying thereto that there is no other name to be saved by, and that he will be a father unto us, and save us, both in this life and in the life to come, and take us from under the damnation of the law and set us under grace and mercy, to be scholars only to learn the law, and that our imperfect deeds shall be

taken in worth ; yea, and though at a time we mar all through our infirmity, yet if we turn again, that shall be forgiven us mercifully, so that we shall be under no damnation : which testament is confirmed with signs and wonders wrought through the Holy Ghost. Now this indented obligation laid apart, we make another of our own imagination between the saints and us, in their merits for our image-service ; which can be but a false faith, seeing it hath not God's word (unto which alone we ought to cleave), but is also clean contrary thereto.

And again, the saints were not saved through their own merits, but through Christ's ; neither were their deeds which they did after they were received under grace sufficient in themselves to fulfil the law for the present time, save as Christ's merits did supply the imperfectness of them, and the which was lacking on their part through their infirmities. And therefore, as the saints' holy works made no satisfaction for the sin they did before they were received under mercy, even so made they none for the deadly sins which they did under mercy, seeing the deeds were imperfect, and had sin annexed unto them by reason of the flesh, and were insufficient to excuse their own masters. What merits have they in store for us, then, seeing, by all men's confession, they now merit not ? If the most obedient child in the world disobey his father's commandments, his fore good deeds cannot make that disobedience no sin, or to be a satisfaction, that the child should presume in the confidence of his old deeds, and think his father should do him wrong to punish him ; but he must acknowledge his fault, and that he hath deserved punishment, and desire forgiveness, unto the glory of his father's mercifulness, and not of his old deeds, though his old obedience be a great presumption that he sinned of frailty, and not of purpose. Even so, if I, being as holy as ever was Paul in his most holiness, sin this day through the frailty of my flesh, mine old deeds can be no satisfaction ; but I must acknowledge my sin unto my Father, and grant that I have deserved damnation, and meekly desire forgiveness, and challenge it by the obligation wherein God hath bound himself to me, unto the glory of the mercy of God, and not to the glory of my holy deeds : for if my deeds save me, it is my glory ; but if he forgive us freely without respect of my deeds, then it is the glory of his mercy, by Paul's doctrine unto the Romans. (c)

Moreover, if the saints be in heaven, then can they be there in none other case than the angels ; in which state Christ testifieth they shall be in the resurrection. Now the angels are ministers sent of God to do service unto the elect, which shall be saved (Heb. i.). And God hath bound himself, that if I

come in the right way, by the door of Christ's blood, and ask help, that he will send me, if need be, an hundred legions of angels or saints. But when God hath bound himself to send me angels or saints, or an angel or saint, he hath not promised to send this angel or that, or this or that saint. And therefore when I appoint God whom he shall send, and bind him, where he hath not bound himself, to send me what saint I will, I tempt God. And thus this choosing of several saints is but tempting of God. And yet we do worse than this: for we leave the way of Christ's blood, and go not to God through him; but run to the saints in a testament of our own making, and will that they either save us themselves for our image-service, or compel God for merits' sake to save us. Why goest thou not unto thy Father thine own self? "I am a sinner (will they say), and dare not." If thou go in the right way, thou hast no sin; Christ hath taken all thy sins from thee, and God hath no rod in his hand, nor looketh sour, but smiling, that it is a joy to behold his glorious countenance, and offereth thee his hand. But this way is stopped up through unbelief, and therefore we seek another which is no way to life, but unto everlasting death. We will not look on the law with open eyes, and therefore have we no due repentance, and so no lust to hearken unto the Gospel of glad tidings in Christ's blood. And where the right way is set before us, and we of malice will not walk therein, God cannot but let the devil play with us, and juggle our eyes to confirm us in blindness.

But after what manner doth Christ pray for us? Verily, Christ, in the days of his mortal flesh, suffered and prayed for all that shall be saved, and obtained and was heard, and had his petitions granted; and he made satisfaction, and purged, and purchased forgiveness, even then, for all the sin that ever shall be forgiven: and his praying for us, and being a mediator now, is that the remembrance of all that he did for us is present in the sight of God the Father, as fresh as the hour he did them; yea, the same hour is yet present, and not past in the sight of God. And Christ is now a King, and reigneth, and hath received power of all that he prayed for, to do it himself: and that whensoever the elect call for aught in his name, he sendeth help, even of that power which he hath received; yea, ere they ask, he sendeth his Spirit into their hearts to move them to ask. So that it is his gift that we desire aught in his name: and in all that we do or think well, he preventeth us with his grace; yea, he careth for us ere we care for ourselves, and when we were yet evil he sendeth to call us, and draweth us with such power that our hearts cannot but consent and

come. And the angels stand by and behold the testament of the elect, how we shall be received into their fellowship, and see all the grace that Christ shall pour out upon us; and they rejoice and praise God for his infinite mercy, and are glad, and long for us, and of very love are ready, against all hours when we shall call for help in Christ's name, to come and help: and Christ sendeth them when we call in his name, and ere we call, even while we be yet evil, and haply persecute the truth of ignorance, as Paul did, the angels wait upon us to keep us, that the devils slay us not before the time of our calling be come.

Now if an angel should appear unto thee, what wouldest thou say unto him? If thou prayedst him to help, he would answer, "I do; Christ hath sent me to help, and believe that the angels be ever about thee to help." If thou desiredst him to pray for thee to obtain this or that, he would say, "Christ hath prayed, and his prayer is heard for whatsoever thou askest in his name," and would shew thee all that God would do to thee, and what he would also have thee to do; and if thou believest, so were thou safe. If thou desiredst him to save thee with his merits, he would answer that he had no merits, but that Christ only is Lord of all merits; nor salvation, but that Christ is Lord of salvation. "Wilt thou, therefore, be saved by merits (would the angel say), then pray to God in Christ's name, and thou shalt be saved by the merits of him, and have me, or some other, thy servant, immediately to help thee unto the uttermost of our power, and to keep thee and bring thee unto the reward of his merits." If thou wouldest promise him to worship him with image-service—that is, to stick up a candle before his image, or such an image as he appeared to thee in—he would answer that he were a spirit, and delighted in no candle-light; but would bid thee give a candle to thy neighbour that lacked, if thou hadst too many. And so would he answer thee if thou wouldest put money in a box for him, or clothe his image in cloth of gold, or put golden shoes upon his image's feet. If thou sayest that thou wouldest build a chapel in his name, he would answer that he dwelt in no house made with stones, but would bid thee go to the churches that are made already, and learn of the preachers there how to believe, and how to live, and honour God in the spirit; for the which cause churches were chiefly builded, and for quietness to pray. And if there be no church, then to give of that thou mayest spare to help that one were builded, to be a preaching and a praying-house, and of worshipping God in the spirit, and not of image-service.

And if Paul appeared unto thee, what other thing could he answer also, than that he were a spirit, and would refuse all thy

image-service? And if thou speak to Paul of his merits, he can none otherwise answer thee than he answered his Corinthians: that he died for no man's sins, and that no man was baptized in his name to trust in his merits. He would say, "I builded all men upon Christ's merits, preaching that all that repented and believed in his name should be saved, and taken from under the wrath, vengeance, and damnation of the law, and be put under mercy and grace. And by this faith was I saved from damnation, and put under mercy and grace, and made one with Christ, to have my part with him and he with me, or rather to make a change that he should have all my sins, and I his mercy and the gifts of his grace, and become glorious with the ornaments of his riches. And of my Saviour Christ I received this law, that I should love my brethren, all God's elect, as tenderly as he loved them: and I consented unto this law, for it seemed right, and became a scholar to learn it. And as I profited in the knowledge, faith, and love of Christ, so I grew in the love of my brethren, and suffered all things for their sakes, and at the last waxed so perfect that I wished myself cast out (if it might have been) to save my brethren. And all my brethren that received Christ received the same commandment, and grew therein: and they that were perfect loved me and all their other brethren, no less than I loved them. And look with what love I ministered the gifts of grace, which I received of Christ for the edifying of his congregation, upon my brethren; with the same love did they minister their gifts again on me, which they had, and I lacked: and so love made all common. And, moreover, if they call my works my merits, I bestowed all my works upon my brethren to teach them, and reaped the fruit thereof, even my brethren's edifying and souls' health; yea, and reap daily, in that I left my doctrine and ensample of living behind me, by which many are converted unto Christ daily. If thou desire, therefore, to enjoy part of my merit, go and read in my Gospel, and thou shalt find the fruit of my labour, the knowledge of Christ, the health of the soul, and everlasting life.

"And as I loved my brethren when I lived, so I love them still, and now more perfectly. Howbeit, my love then was painful; for the more I loved the more I sorrowed, feared, and cared for them, to bring them into the knowledge of the truth, and to keep them in unity of faith, lest the false prophets should deceive them, or their own infirmities should break peace and unity, or cause them to fall into any sin.

"But now my love is without pain, for I see the will and providence of God, and how the end of all things shall be unto his

glory and profit of the elect. And though I see the elect shall sometimes fall, yet I see how they shall arise again, and how that their fall shall be unto the glory of God and their own profit. And we that are in heaven love you all alike; neither we love one more and another less. And, therefore, if ye love us more one than another, that is fleshly, as mine old Corinthians once loved, and I rebuked them. Neither can we be moved to come more to help one than another; but we wait when God will send any of us unto the elect that call for help in Christ's name. Wherefore, if thou wilt be holpen of any of us, pray in Christ's name, and God shall send one of us, an angel or a saint, to keep the power of the devils from you; but not whom thou wouldest choose, tempting God, but whom it pleaseth God to send.

“And if your preachers love you not after the same manner, to edify you with the true doctrine of Christ, and example of living thereafter, and to keep you in unity of faith and charity, they be not of Christ's disciples, but Antichrists, which, under the name of Christ, seek to reign over you as temporal tyrants. And in like manner, if this be not written in your hearts, that ye ought to love one another as Christ loved you, and as ye had example of us his Apostles, ye go astray in vanities, and are not in the right way.”

THE
NATURE OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST'S DEATH,
AND THE
INFINITE MERIT OF HIS SUFFERINGS.

BY THE RIGHT REV. FATHER IN GOD,
THOMAS BILSON, BISHOP OF WINCHESTER.

(Reprinted from the Edition of 1599)

THE effects of Christ's cross, though I might reckon many, yet, to keep myself within some compass, I restrain to five chief branches: the merit of his suffering, which was infinite; the manner of his offering, which was bloody; the power of his death, which was mighty; the comfort of his cross, which was necessary; and the glory of his resurrection, which was heavenly. These five will direct us, not only what to believe, but what to refuse, in the person and passion of our Saviour: I will, therefore, take them as they lie in order.

The merit of Christ's suffering must be simply infinite, that it may work two things for us—to wit, redeem us from Satan, and reconcile us unto God; clear us from hell, and bring us to heaven; and in either respect it must be infinite. “The wages of sin is death,” both of body and soul, here and for ever. With the Judge of the world is no unrighteousness; he, therefore, punisheth no man without cause, or above desert. Since the revenge of each man's sin is eternal, that is, infinite in time, the weight of each man's sin must needs be infinite, as being rewarded with everlasting death. It may seem much, to carnal men, that God should requite sin with ever-during revenge; but if we seriously bethink ourselves what it is for earth and ashes to wax proud against God, and, after so manifold and abundant blessings, to cast off his yoke, and readily, yea greedily, to prefer every vanity and fancy before his heavenly truth and glory, we shall presently perceive how just cause God hath infinitely to hate our uncleanness, and eternally to pursue the pride, contempt, and rebellion of wicked and wilful men against his Divine Majesty: howsoever we digest it, it is a thing determined with God, and no doubt balanced in his upright and sincere judgment. “The soul that sinneth, that soul shall die” (Ezek. xviii.) Death and life are both eternal; that is, infinite in length, though not in weight; in durance, though not in degree and sense of joy or pain: then, in either respect, to countervail our deliver-

ance from hell, and our inheritance in heaven, the merit of Christ's suffering must be infinite; an infinite purchase cannot be made but with an infinite price. (*d*)

For this infinite price, whither shall we seek? to the pains of hell, or to the powers of heaven? The pains of hell are neither meritorious nor infinite. What thanks with God to be separated from God? And the soul being alienated from God, what other part of man can merit his favour? "If any man fall away, my soul shall have no pleasure in him" (Heb. x.) Hell pains, therefore, are accursed, not accepted of God; and he that suffereth them is hated, and no way beloved. "Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire" (Matt. xxv.) As they are not meritorious, no more are they infinite—I mean in weight—but they must everlastingly be suffered before they can be infinite; for not only devils, but men of all sorts shall suffer them, who cannot endure any infinite sense of pain. All creatures are finite, both in force to do and strength to suffer: infinite is as much as God himself hath; and, therefore, God alone is infinite: so that neither hell-fire is of infinite force to punish, nor men nor angels of infinite strength to suffer; but the vengeance of sin continueth for ever, by reason no creature is able to bear an infinite weight of punishment. Since, then, the pains of hell have neither worth nor weight sufficient in themselves to satisfy the anger and procure the favour of God, we must seek to heaven, even to God himself, for the true ransom for our sins and redemption of our souls; which we nowhere find but in the person of Christ Jesus, who, being true God, took our nature unto him, and by the infinite price of his blood bought us from the power of hell, and brought us unto God: for neither the virtues of Christ's human soul, though they were many, nor the sufferings of his flesh, though they were painful, are simply infinite till we look to his person, and then shall we find that God vouchsafed "with his own blood to purchase his Church" (Acts xx.), and that "we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son when we were his enemies" (Rom. v.) Bernard, expressing the infinite merit of Christ's death and passion, saith, "*Incomprehensibilis (Deus voluit) comprehendi, summus humiliari, potentissimus despici, pulcherrimus deformari, sapientissimus ut jumentum fieri, immortalis mori, ut compendio absolvam, Deus fieri (voluit) vermiculus; quid excelsius Deo? quid inferius vermiculo?*" (Bernard de Passion, cap. xvii.)—The Incomprehensible (God would) be comprehended, the highest humbled, the most mighty despised, the most beautiful deformed, the most wise be like a beast, the immortal (would) suffer death; to speak all in few words, God would become a worm: what is higher than God?—what is baser than a worm?—If between

the Creator and the best of his creatures there be an infinite distance, what think ye, then, was there betwixt the throne of God in heaven and the cross of Christ on earth? Even an infinite distance, and so infinite that neither men nor angels can comprehend it. The ground of our salvation, then, is the obedience, humility, and charity of the Son of God, yielding himself not only to serve in our stead, but to die for our sins; for when he was equal with God in nature, power, and glory, he refused not to take the shape of a servant upon him, and to humble himself to the death of the cross; not only obeying his Father's will, which we had despised, but abiding his hand for the chastisement of our peace. The Apostle noteth these three virtues in the person of Christ—"Let the same affection (of love) be in you which was in Christ Jesus, who, being in the form of God, emptied and humbled himself, and became obedient to the death, even to the death of the cross" (Philip. ii.) By his humility, obedience, and charity, he purged the pride, rebellion, and self-love, which our first father shewed when he fell, and we all express in our sins; and, therefore, as we all died in Adam's transgression, so we are all justified, that is, absolved from our sins, and received into favour, by the obedience of Christ. (e)

Yea, the obedience of Christ did in far higher degree please God the Father, than the rebellion of Adam did displease him; for there the vassal rebelled, here the equal obeyed; there earth presumed to be like unto God, here God vouchsafed to be the lowest among men; there the creature neglected his Maker, here the Creator so loved his enemies, even his persecutors, that he took the burthen from their shoulders and laid it on his own, contentedly giving his life for them who cruelly took his life from him: to conclude, those were the sins of men, these are the virtues of God, which do infinitely countervail the other; and, for that cause, the justice of God is far better satisfied with the obedience of Christ, than with the vengeance it might justly have executed on the sins of men: "for God hath no pleasure in the death of the wicked" (Ezek. xxxiii.), neither doth he delight in man's destruction; but with the obedience of his Son he is well pleased, and therein even his soul delighteth. "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased" (Matt. iii.) "Lo, my chosen, my soul taketh pleasure in him" (Isaiah xlii.) In which words God doth not only note the natural love betwixt his Son and himself, but he giveth full approbation of his obedience, as being thereby thoroughly satisfied for the sin of man. By Christ's obedience, I do not mean the holiness of his life or performance of the law, but the obedience of the person unto death, even the death of the cross, which was voluntarily offered

by him, not necessarily imposed on him, above and besides the law, and no way required in the law : for it could be no duty to God or man, but only mercy and pity towards us, that caused the Son of God to take our mortal and weak flesh unto him, and therein and thereby to pay the ransom of our sins, and to purchase eternal life for us. He must be a Saviour—no debtor; a Redeemer—no prisoner; Lord of all, even when he humbled himself to be the servant of all. His divine glory, power, and majesty, make his sufferings to be of infinite force and value. And from his dignity and unity of person, which is the main pillar of our redemption, if we cast our eyes on any other cause, or devise any new help to strengthen the merits of Christ, we dishonour and disable his divinity, as if the Son of God were not a full and sufficient price to ransom the bodies and souls of all mankind.

On this foundation do the Scriptures build the whole frame of man's redemption. "God purchased his Church (saith Paul) with his own blood" (Acts xx.): *God*, noting the dignity; *his own*, the unity of his person; and both importing a price far worthier than the thing purchased. "God spared not his own Son, but gave him for us all" (Rom. viii.) In that he was the Son of God, all nations are counted unto him (or in balance with him) "less than nothing, and vanity" (Isaiah xl.); in that he was given for us, the ransom excelleth the prisoner as much as God doth man. "We are reconciled to God by the death of his Son" (Rom. v.) Marvel we to see Christ's death of that power and price with God, that it appeased his wrath when he was angry with us, as with his enemies; when as his own Son, being equal with him in the form of God, he humbled himself to the death of the cross for our sakes? Fairer or fuller causes of our redemption we need not ask, the Holy Ghost doth not express, God cannot have. If the Son of God be not able with his blood to redeem us, we must give over all hope, and despair; for heaven cannot yield us a greater value, and the earth hath none like. Wherefore, if any man be disposed to seal his own condemnation, with his own heart, let him distrust the merits of Christ's death; (*f*) but all that will be saved must acknowledge the infinite price of his death and blood above our worth; and we must learn, being sinful and wretched creatures, not to amend the words of God, in the mystery of our redemption, but suffer him that is truth to be the guider of our faith, and not, by figures, to frustrate all that is written in the word of God touching our salvation, purchased by the death and blood of Christ Jesus.

I am not the first that observed or urged this doctrine; it is *ancient* and *catholic*. "Cum super omnes esset Dei verbum,

merito suum ipsius templum et corporale instrumentum pro omnium animis pretium offerens, id quod morti debebatur per soluit (Athanasius de Incarnatione Citatus a Theodoro Dialogo, iii.)—Whereas the Word (or Son) of God (saith Athanasius) was above all; worthily, then, by offering his own temple and bodily instrument, as a price for the souls of men, did he pay that was due unto death.—Cyril: “Si non esset Deus, quomodo ipse et solus sufficeret ad hoc, ut sit pretium? Sed sufficit solus pro omnibus mortuus, quia super omnes est; Deus igitur est, morte suæ carnis à mundo mortem depellens” (Cyril de Recta fide ad Reginas, in 1 Tim. ii., dedit semetipsum pretium pro nobis)—If Christ were not God, how could he alone suffice to be the ransom (for all)? But he alone, dead, sufficeth for all, (*g*) because he is above all; he is therefore God, by the death of his flesh, carrying away death from the world.—And again: “Redempti sumus Christo proprium corpus dante pro nobis. Sed si ut communis homo intelligeretur Christus, quomodo corpus ejus ad rependendam omnium vitam sufficeret? At si Deus fuit in carne, qui dignissimus, sufficiens ad redemptionem totius mundi per suum sanguinem merito fuit” (Cyril de Recta fide ad Reginas, in 1 Pet. i., pretioso sanguine Christi redempti estis)—We are redeemed, Christ giving his own body for us. But if Christ be taken to be no more than a man, how should his body be sufficient to restore life to all men? But if he were God in our flesh, worthily, then, did he suffice to redeem the whole world with his blood.—Austen: “Si propter hominem mortuus est Deus, non est victurus homo cum Deo? Quomodo mortuus est Deus? Accepit ex te unde moreretur pro te; non posset mori nisi caro non posset mori nisi mortale corpus” (August. in Ps. cxlviii.)—If God died for man, shall not man live with God? But how died God? He took of thine wherein to die for thee. There could nothing die but flesh, there could nothing die but a mortal body.—And elsewhere, an ancient writer, under his name, if not himself: “Indubitanter credamus quod totum mundum redemit, qui plus dedit quam totus mundus valeret: inter redimentem et redemptum dispensatio, non compensatio fuit” (August. de Tempore, cxiv.)—Let us undoubtedly believe that he redeemed the whole world, which gave more than the whole world was worth. Between the Redeemer and the redeemed there was a dispensation (of humility), no compensation (of equality).—And, to shew the truth of his speech, he addeth: “Innocency was arraigned for the guilty, mercy was buffeted for the cruel, piety was whipped for the ungodly, wisdom was mocked for the foolish, righteousness was condemned for the unrighteous, truth was slain for the liar, life died for him that was dead” (August. de Tempore, cxiv.) And do we yet, remembering who he was and

what we were, stagger to confess, with these Christian and Catholic Fathers, that his blood was a most sufficient price for all the world? Or wonder we to see death overthrown by his death, who was the fountain of life, and could no more be swallowed up of death than God himself could be conquered by the power of darkness?

“The mightier Christ’s person, the more able he was (some will say) to suffer death and hell.” He would be partaker of our mortal infirmity, that, by suffering death for the time, he might conquer the force thereof for ever; but the gates of hell could not prevail against him, “because the prince of this world had nothing in him.” The inward man may be strongest when the outward man is weakest; and when the flesh is nearest unto death, the spirit may cleave fastest unto God. Christ, therefore, in dying for our sakes, shewed a most evident and eminent example of his obedience, love, and patience; but in suffering hell, there is no sign of grace nor shew of virtue. Voluntarily to forsake God, or willingly to be forsaken of God, is the greatest impiety that can be committed. And against his will Christ never did, nor might, suffer anything: for that had been violence, not obedience; vengeance, not patience; force, not love. But all constraint was far from Christ, that his sufferings might be a voluntary sacrifice, to witness his love and declare his merits, which in compulsion could be none. Since, then, the Son of God neither willingly would nor forcibly could be forsaken of his Father, it is a dangerous device to subject his soul to hell, which is the total and final separation of the wicked from God and his kingdom.

And that we may a little the better bethink ourselves, before we grow too resolute in this assertion, that Christ’s soul suffered the very pains of hell, I will observe some things which the Scriptures affirm of hell, and may not be applied to Christ without apparent injury. First, hell is outward and inward darkness. Now Christ was light, and in him was no darkness of the soul. “As long as I am in the world, I am (saith he) the light of the world” (John ix.) Then as “the light hath no fellowship with darkness” (2 Cor. vi.), no more hath Christ with hell, which is the “power of darkness from whence he hath delivered us” (Col. i.) Secondly, hell is destruction both of body and soul. “Fear not them (saith Christ) which kill the body, but cannot kill the soul; fear Him rather which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell” (Matt. x.) In the Saviour of both, we may not admit the destruction of both. How shall he save us, that could hardly, and, as some write, “*maxima cum difficultate*” (with much ado), save himself? But “God sent his Son to be the Saviour of the world” (1 John, iv.); we must not, therefore, wrap him within the destruction of body and soul—

no, not for an hour, or an instant. Thirdly, hell is the second death : the first is of the body, for a time ; the second is of the soul, for ever. “ The lake burning with fire and brimstone, this is the second death ” (saith St. John, Apoc. xx.) Of this death, Austen saith : “ De prima corporis morte dici potest quòd bonis bona sit et malis mala ; secunda vero sine dubio sicut nullorum est bonorum, ita nulli bona. Ideo vero secunda, quia post illam primam est ” (August. de Civi. Dei., lib. xiii., cap. ii.)—The first death of the body is good to the good, and evil to the evil ; but the second death, without doubt, as no good man suffereth it, so is it good to none ; and therefore it is called the second death, because it followeth after the first.—Before the first death, no man suffereth hell, which is the second death : and before we may avouch it of Christ, we must take all goodness from him ; for “ doubtless (saith Austen) no good man doth suffer it.” And, indeed, how pernicious it is to make the soul of Christ liable to the death of the soul, I shall afterward have occasion to speak. In the mean time, St. John affirmeth, that hell goeth not before death, but followeth after death : “ I looked (saith he), and beheld a pale horse, and his name that sat on him was Death, and hell followed after him ” (Apoc. vi.) : and, therefore, it cannot stand with truth, to subject the soul of Christ, yet living on earth, to the very pains of the damned. Fourthly, “ their worm (in hell) never dieth ” (Mark ix.) ; for so much as the remembrance of their sins committed against God everlastingly biteth and afflicteth the conscience. Now in Christ, as there was no taint of sin, so could there be no touch of conscience accusing, nor remorse of any transgression against God. With compassion of our sins he might be moved and troubled, but worm of conscience he could have none, who was privy to his own heart, that “ he was holy, harmless, undefiled, and separated from sinners ” (Heb. vii.), and therefore needed no sacrifice for his own sins ; but, as “ a faithful and merciful high priest (by the offering of himself), once, made an atonement for the sins of the people ” (Heb. ii.)

But what the pains of the damned are, the sentence of the Judge will best declare : “ *Discedite à me maledicti in ignem æternum* ”—Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels (Matt. xxv.) ;—in which words there are four things which by no means can agree unto Christ : rejection, malediction, vengeance of fire, and continuance therein for ever. As sin is a voluntary separation of man from God, so hell is a total and final exclusion of the sinful from enjoying the presence or patience of God any longer. The time of this life is the respite of God’s patience towards all the wicked ; with the end thereof beginneth his eternal ven-

geance, which wholly and for ever debarreth the workers of wickedness from the kingdom of God. This rejection the soul of Christ could not suffer, being inseparably joined to the Godhead of Christ. We must not, instead of a natural and mutual conjunction, believe or teach a real and effectual separation betwixt God and man, in the person of Christ; no, not a persuasion thereof in the soul of our Saviour, which is all one with desperation, and sheweth the condition rather of the reprobate than of the children of God, much less of him that was God and man. As the Son of God could not be rejected, no more could he be accursed. He that is joined with God must needs be partaker of God's goodness. God is the fountain of all bliss; he therefore filleth with his blessing all that are united unto him: and if we, when we cleave unto him by faith and love, must needs derive from him joy and bliss, could the soul of Christ be personally joined with him, and not be perpetually blessed by him? Though, then, it pleased our Saviour to suffer a cursed kind of death for our sins, and, by receiving that curse in his flesh, to quench the spiritual and eternal curse that hung over our heads, yet his soul was never accursed, since he was always beloved: and the curse of God compriseth, not only the anger and hatred, but the intolerable and unceaseable vengeance of God, which pursueth the souls and bodies of the wicked with flaming fire for ever. For how could "all nations of the earth be blessed in him" (Gen. xxii.), if he himself were accursed? But God "sent him to bless us" (Acts iii.); he must, therefore, be stored with fulness of blessing, first for himself, then for us all.

And could we frame our tongues (which I hope all Christians with heart detest) so much to dishonour the person of Christ, as to avouch him to be truly rejected and accursed of his Father for the time, be it never so short, yet we must not shew ourselves so void of all sense, as to say that Christ's soul suffered hell-fire; which is the perpetual and essential punishment of all the damned. Let us not come within that danger of so desperate folly, not to know, or not to care, what we defend or affirm: it should have some proof, it should have some truth, whatsoever is held for matter of faith. That Christ's soul was tormented with hell-fire, I ask not what proof or truth, but what shew can be pretended? The fire of hell they will say is metaphorical; they that go thither shall find it no metaphor. It is no good dallying with God's eternal and terrible judgments. The Scriptures are so plain, and so full of the parts and effects of fire in hell, that I dare not allegorize them. Christ made the rich man's soul in hell to say, "I am tormented in this flame" (Luke xvi.) St. John saith, it is a "lake burning with

fire and brimstone" (Rev. xxi.) Daniel saith, "a fiery stream issued from before Christ sitting in judgment" (Dan. vii.) Paul saith, it is "a violent fire, which shall devour the adversaries" (Heb. x.) God himself saith, "a fire is kindled in my wrath, and shall burn to the bottom of hell, and shall inflame the foundations of the hills" (Deut. xxxii.) If, therefore, the pains of the damned come in question, it is not safe to measure them by our imaginations, but to give ear to the Holy Ghost, who can best express them; and by him we learn, that "if any man worship the beast and his image, he shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, and shall be tormented in fire and brimstone before the holy angels, and before the Lamb; and the smoke of their torment shall ascend evermore, and they shall have no rest night nor day" (Rev. xiv.) Into this fire if we cast Christ's soul, we must take heed our proofs be sound and sure, lest our presumption exclude us from the place where Christ is, and leave us in the lake where he never was; there to learn what it is rashly to conclude the things that are not confirmed by the word of God. But I persuade myself, few men of learning or religion will venture on this desperate resolution, that Christ's soul here on earth suffered hell-fire; and, therefore, to propose it, is enough to confute it.

The last thing in hell-fire is, that it is eternal; for as there is no remission of pain, so thence is no redemption; but once adjudged thither, is everlastingly fastened to that place of torment. And this is cause enough to stay all men that be soberly minded from defending that Christ's soul suffered the pains of hell, which the Holy Ghost saith are endless. "They which know not God and obey not the Gospel shall suffer pains, even everlasting perdition, from the presence of the Lord" (saith the Apostle to the Thessalonians, 2 Epist., chap. i.) And so Peter: "To whom the mist of darkness is reserved for ever" (2 Pet. ii.) And Jude: "Sodom and Gomorrah are set for an example, which suffer the punishment of everlasting fire." Yea, Christ himself pronounceth that fire to be "unquenchable" (Mark ix.) Wherefore, unless we can shew a later and better warrant than I yet see, we shall do well not to enterprise to quench hell-fire, but to let it burn eternally, and to confess, with Peter, that God raised Christ, breaking the pains of death and hell, "of which it was impossible he should be held" (Acts ii.); for since he was and is the "Saviour of his body" (Eph. v.), the pains of hell, which are eternal, could not take hold on him. He was mightier than hell that saved us from hell; he could not free us from the chains of darkness, but he must first break them asunder. His delivering us from the power of Satan, proveth him to be stronger than Satan; and the stronger could

never be bound by the weaker; but contrariwise, "he entered into Satan's house, where his chief strength was, and bound him, and so spoiled him" (Matt. xii.) This comparison Christ maketh betwixt Satan and himself; by which he concludeth that he was stronger than Satan, and, consequently, could not himself be bound by death or hell; but "overcame Satan, and took all his armour from him wherein he trusted, and divided the spoils" (Luke xi.)

And where some men begin to doubt whether eternal continuance be of the nature and substance of hell or no, they shall do well to leave these dangerous and fruitless speculations; for whether they look to the persons for whom, or the crimes for which, or the Judge by whom, it was prepared, they shall every way find it must be eternal. It was "prepared for the devil and his angels" (Matt. xxv.); and to them could no punishment be allotted but everlasting, except we will give possibility of grace and hope of repentance unto devils. It is the wages of sin, which, being an infinite contempt of the Divine Majesty, must, by the balance of justice, have infinite vengeance in weight or in length. And since no creature is able to bear an infinite burden and sense of pain, of force all sinful creatures must be condemned to an infinite length of punishment, which is hell-fire. Lastly, as God is eternal and cannot change, no more can his justice or judgment alter with time: but as his truth abideth for ever, so his judgment, being just and good, is irrevocable; and consequently the vengeance of sin can never cease, as proceeding from the righteous Judge of the world, in whom is "no shadowing nor varying" (James i.) And therefore Paul calleth the "judgment eternal" (Heb. vi.), whereby God shall reward every man according to his works; and our Saviour forewarneth us, not in vain, that hell-fire is "unquenchable and everlasting" (Mark ix.) Since, then, neither the remorse, rejection, malediction, nor desperation of the damned, nor the darkness, destruction, death, and fire of hell can, without evident impiety, be attributed to the soul of Christ, I am far from admitting into any part of the creed this ambiguous, if not dangerous assertion, that Christ in his soul, on the cross, felt the very pains and torments of the damned; but I prefer the simple and plain doctrine of the Holy Ghost, which teacheth us that Christ "died for our sins, according to the Scriptures, and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day, according to the Scriptures; and by Christ so doing, death was swallowed up into victory" (1 Cor. xv.); and we may joyfully say, "O death, where is thy sting? O hell, where is thy victory?" Thanking God which hath given this victory, through our Lord Jesus Christ" (1 Cor. xv.); as it was forespoken by the prophet Isaiah

—"The Lord will destroy death for ever" (Isaiah xxv.); and by Hosea, "O death, I will be thy death; O hell, I will be thy destruction" (Hosea xiii.)

The manner of Christ's offering is the second effect of Christ's cross, which must be bloody before it can be propitiatory. In this part I will deliver you three things worthy to be observed: with what sacrifice God was pleased for our sins; with what price the devil was concluded for our ransom; with what seal the new covenant of grace and mercy was confirmed unto us for our safety: these three depend each on other. God, as the Judge offended, was to have a sacrifice for our sin that might content him; the devil, as the jailor, was to have a ransom for us, that were, by God's justice, delivered into his hands; ourselves, as prisoners, were to be restored by God's pardon, and to be assured of his protection, that the like misery might not the second time prevail against us; which is performed by the New Testament of mercy forgiving, and grace repressing sin, that we relapse not into the pit of perdition whence we were delivered.

What was the true propitiatory sacrifice which God accepted for the sins of the world, if the New Testament did not plainly declare, the Old Testament would sufficiently witness unto us. For as well patriarchs as prophets, yea, all the godly from Abel to Christ, did, by their sacrifices and service of God, profess and confirm their faith to be this: that they looked for the seed of the woman, who, by his death and blood, should purge their sins, and make peace between God and them. This was the promise of grace which God made in Paradise to our first parents, threatening the serpent with the seed of the woman, in these words: "He shall crush thine head, and thou shalt bruise his heel" (Gen. iii.) As the heel of man is the basest part of his body and nearest the earth, so the serpent should bruise the weakest and earthliest part of Christ; but even that bruised heel should be of force enough to crush the serpent's head; for by the flesh of Christ, wounded and blood shed, the power and pride of Satan should be conquered and confounded. This sense of God's promise made to his parents, Abel, the first martyr, by faith accepted, by sacrifice adored; and, in that respect, his bodily and bloody offering was preferred before his brother's. This faith did all the patriarchs testify by their bloody sacrifices, that they expected the body of the Messiah to be bruised and his blood to be shed, for the remission of their sins; and as they received it from their fathers, so they delivered it to their children for the sheet-anchor of all their hope. This God did ratify by his law written, suffering his people to have no sacrifices for sin but such as represented the bloody offering of Christ on the cross: so that all the sacrifices and sacraments of Moses' law

were nothing else but figures and “examples of better things” (Heb. ix.), as the Apostle calls them; namely, of Christ’s body once to be offered, and his blood once to be shed, for the abolishing of sin. The figures of Christ before and under the law, what else do they point, but to the death, blood, and cross of Christ, to be the redemption and salvation of all mankind? Abraham’s readiness to offer up Isaac, for which the blessing was annexed to him with an oath, what doth it import but the love of God “not sparing his own Son, but giving him for us all?” (Rom. viii.) The blood of the passover sprinkled on the posts of the Israelites to avert the destroyer, doth it not represent the blood of that immaculate Lamb which saveth us from the fierceness of God’s wrath? The lifting up the brazen serpent to cure the people that were stung with fiery serpents, doth it not foreshow Christ hanging on the cross to cure our souls from the poison of sin, which is the sting of that deadly serpent? The strength of Samson pulling the house on his own and his enemies’ heads, doth it not declare the voluntary death of Christ to be the destruction of death and hell, which insulted at him on the cross?

When the truth came, expressed by all these sacrifices and resembled in all these figures, what offering made he on the altar of the cross? Did he yield his soul to the pains of hell, or his body to be crucified of the Jews? Both, they will say; for so they must say, except they will have their supposal of hell pains clean excluded from the sacrifice for sin. But which of these two was believed of the patriarchs, witnessed by the sacrifices, shadowed in the figures of the law, expected of the faithful from the foundation of the world? The bloody sacrifice of Christ’s body is so plainly proclaimed by them all, that there can be no question of their faith and expectation. And were they deceived in the object of their faith and hope? Did they all mistake the true sacrifice for their sins; and did God, by his law, confirm them in that error? And doth the Apostle falsely conclude, from the sacrifices of the law, that Christ’s offering, before it could take away sin, must of force be bloody? These were very strange positions in Christian religion, and yet I see not how we shall avoid them, if we stiffly maintain the suffering of hell pains to be the chief and principal part of our redemption, without which the rest is nothing. If their faith, fastened on the death and blood of Christ for the remission of their sins, did save them, then was the death of Christ of force enough, without the pains of hell, to release them from their sins, and bring them unto God. And if it wrought that effect in them, it is still of the same power and strength to work the like in us. If it were insufficient to release them from the rigour of God’s

wrath, then are the patriarchs perished in their sins, by mistaking the true price of their redemption; for that they knew anything of Christ's suffering hell pains, I think will hardly be proved. But out of question their faith was right, which was settled on the blood of Christ to be shed for the redeeming of their sins; and themselves are saints in God's kingdom. We must, therefore, take heed that we do not rashly vary from the foundation of their faith and hope, which must likewise be ours, with this only difference, that they believed in him which should take away the sins of the world by his death and cross, and we in him that hath taken them away: the time doth differ, but the means are still the same. "The Lamb was slain from the beginning of the world" (Rev. xiii.); not actually, but in the counsel of God, which did purpose it, and in the truth of God, which did promise it; as likewise in the faith of all his saints, which did rest and rejoice in it; from whose steps if we swerve, we may not look to be Abraham's children, that refuse Abraham's faith as erroneous, and challenge our father for misbelief.

If the offerings and faith of the patriarchs were not pregnant enough to lead us to the true sacrifice for sin, the Apostle to the Hebrews doth so purposely and positively handle it, that I much muse how any man of judgment or learning can mistake it; for if we mark but three conclusions which the Apostle maketh, we cannot err from the truth in this behalf. The true sacrifice for sin must be but one, and once offered, not often, no iterated, by reason it is perfect and able to cleanse us from all sin. It must be bloody, for so were all the offerings of the law, and "without shedding of blood is no remission" (Heb. ix.) It must be confirmed by death, that redemption purchased might never be revoked nor altered. These three positions are mainly and mightily urged by the Holy Ghost, in Hebrews ix. and x.; and for this faith are all the fathers of the Old Testament, from Abel to Samuel, praised in the eleventh chapter of that epistle. "This man (saith Paul, meaning Christ), after he had offered one sacrifice for sin, sitteth for ever at the right hand of God: for with one offering had he made perfect for ever those which are sanctified. Now where remission (of sin) is, there is no more offering for sin" (Heb. x.) Christ, then, making but one offering for sin, we must not make two, but rather learn what that one was; which we may do without any difficulty, since the Apostle so plainly teacheth us, that "we are sanctified by the offering of the body of Jesus once; that by his own blood Christ entered in once into the holy place, and found eternal redemption. Almost all things are by the law purged with blood, and without shedding of blood is no remission. It was, then, necessary that the similitudes of heavenly things (in the

law) should be purified with such things (as the blood of bulls and goats), but heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these (even with the blood of Christ). For if the blood of bulls and goats sanctifieth, as touching the purifying of the flesh, how much more shall the blood of Christ, who, through the Eternal Spirit, offered himself without spot to God, purge your consciences from dead works to serve the living God? And for this cause is he the Mediator of the New Testament, that through death, which was for the redemption of the transgressions in the former Testament, they which were called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance. For where a testament is, there must be the death of him that made the testament; for it is of no force so long as he that made it is alive; wherefore, neither was the first Testament ordained without blood" (Heb. ix.) "Jesus then suffered without the gate, that he might sanctify the people with his own blood; and this is the blood of the everlasting Testament, through which God brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus" (Heb. xiii.) Christ confirmeth the same when he saith, "This is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins" (Matt. xxvi.)

The words be plainer, then, that they need any commentary. There was but one sacrifice that could abolish sin; even the oblation of the body of Jesus once, whose blood purged our consciences from dead works, and purchased eternal inheritance, by the testator's death, for the redemption of those sins which we committed against the former Testament. What shift have we to shun the force of these words, or to bring in the pains of hell in Christ's soul, as a part of the propitiatory sacrifice for sin? Christ made but one oblation of himself for sin, and that was the suffering of death in his body for the redemption of our transgressions, and shedding of his blood for the remission of our sins. More than one he needed not make, for that one obtained eternal redemption; and other than this he did not make, for his offering was both bodily and bloody. "This is my body which is given" (Luke xxii.) and "broken for you" (1 Cor. xi.); "this is my blood which is shed for many" (Mark xiv.) The oblation of the body of Jesus once, and the shedding of his blood, are of strength and force enough to cleanse us from our sins, and to procure us the promise of everlasting inheritance; which, being confirmed by the death of the testator, standeth irrevocable. How can we, then, bring in another sacrifice of Christ's soul suffering the pains of hell, which could be neither bodily nor bloody, but we must increase the number, and confound the differences of Christ's offerings, and weaken the force of his external and corporal sacrifice, which was the truth that

answered and accomplished all the signs of the law? For the invisible pains of hell are nowhere prefigured in the sacrifices of the law, that I find, nor so much as once mentioned in the Apostle's discourse of Christ's sacrifice for sin, that I read; and, therefore, if we add them as a necessary part of our redemption, we derogate from the blood of Christ, as insufficient, without those torments, to cleanse us from our sins, and pacify the wrath of God that was kindled against us.

What danger it is to depart from the manifest words of the Holy Ghost in so high a point of faith, and by things unwritten to discredit things written, I need not admonish such as be learned; let the simple take heed that they suffer not reason to overrule religion, and obscure and doubtful places in the Scriptures to wrest from them the perspicuous and perpetual doctrine of the Holy Ghost. How full and perfect the redemption is which we have by the blood of Christ, if you search the Scriptures you shall easily see; if you do but hearken, you shall presently learn. The blood of Christ doth redeem, cleanse, wash, justify, and sanctify the elect; it doth pacify and propitiate the Judge; it doth seal the covenant of mercy, grace, and glory, betwixt God and man; it doth conclude and bind the devil: what more can be required I verily cannot conjecture. If the blood of Christ perform all these things for us—and more we cannot ask or expect—why shrink we from it as unable to save us, except it be supplied with the pains of hell? Whether I affirm anything of mine own, or deliver you that which is plainly taught in the Scriptures, judge you. “Ye were redeemed (saith Peter) by the precious blood of Christ, as of a Lamb unspotted and undefiled” (1 Peter, i.) “Christ, by his own blood (saith Paul), entered once into the holy place, obtaining eternal redemption” (Heb. ix.) “The blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from all our sins” (1 John, i.) “He washed us from our sins in his blood” (Rev. i.) “Being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him” (Rom. v.) “Jesus suffered that he might sanctify the people with his blood” (Heb. xiii.) By Christ, then, “we have redemption through his blood, even the remission of sins” (Eph. i.); and “now, in Christ Jesus, ye which once were far off are made near by the blood of Christ” (Eph. ii.) “For it hath pleased (the Father) by him to reconcile all things unto himself; and to pacify, through the blood of his cross, both things in earth and things in heaven” (Col. i.) “Whom God hath purposed to be a reconciliation through faith in his blood” (Rom. iii.)

And therefore the New Testament is sealed with Christ's blood. “This is (saith he) my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins” (Matt. xxvi.)

“Ye are come to Jesus, the Mediator of the New Testament (saith Paul), and to the blood of sprinkling, which speaketh better things then that of Abel” (Heb. xii.) ; for Abel’s blood cried for vengeance, but Christ’s blood speaketh for mercy and grace; and for that cause Paul calleth it “the blood of the everlasting Testament” (Heb. xiii.) “For this is the Testament that I will make with the house of Israel: after those days, saith the Lord, I will put my laws in their mind, and in their heart will I write them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people; I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and I will remember their sins and iniquities no more” (Heb. viii.) This Testament of mercy, grace, and glory, is confirmed by the death of Christ, and sealed with his blood; which if we weaken or frustrate with our inventions or additions, we must look for that fearful judgment which the Apostle threateneth: “He that despiseth Moses’ law dieth without mercy, under two or three witnesses; of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be worthy which treadeth under foot the Son of God, and counteth unholy the blood of the Testament wherewith he was sanctified, and reproacheth the Spirit of grace?” (Heb. x.) The wrong that is offered to the blood of the New Testament treadeth under foot the Son of God, and reproacheth the Spirit of grace. Now how can we more unsanctify the blood of the Testament, than to make it so unprecious that it cannot redeem us without the pains of hell; or to set up another price, for which we have no express record, against or above the blood of Christ, by which we are cleansed from our sins and reconciled to God?

I know they will and must answer, the pains of hell are contained in the blood of Christ; for so much as he suffered the one, in their imagination, when he shed the other. Could they prove, by express and infallible testimonies (which they cannot do), that Christ suffered in soul the pains of the damned, they had some reason to comprise the one within the other; but no such thing being warranted or witnessed in the Scriptures, they must take heed that they do not elude, rather than expound, the words of the Holy Ghost with a perpetual synecdoche, which shall frustrate the very force of all those evident and vehement speeches. For it is strange to me, first, that, without just proof, any such thing should be joined to the blood of Christ, to help the price thereof. Next, that the Holy Ghost should always urge the one, and, as it were, continually forget the other. Thirdly, the things which are named in the Scriptures, as they were the last, so are they the chiefest parts of Christ’s sufferings, the rest being understood as antecedent to them, and not eminent above them. Now the cross, blood, and death of Christ are everywhere mentioned in the Scriptures as the very ground-

work and pillars of our redemption. Lastly, the body of Christ wounded, and his blood shed, for the remission of sins, are the seals that confirm and ratify the New Testament; and therefore they give chiefest power and strength to the whole covenant, as appeareth by the sacraments; which import unto us, not the pains of hell, but the death and blood of Christ, as the right and true means of our redemption. "Know ye not (saith Paul) that all we which have been baptized into Jesus Christ have been baptized into his death? We are buried, then, with him, by baptism, into his death" (Rom vi.) And, speaking of the Lord's Supper, he saith, "As often as ye shall eat this bread and drink this cup, ye shew the Lord's death until he come" (1 Cor. xi.) "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of Christ's blood? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of Christ's body?" (1 Cor. x.) By these we are grafted into Christ; by these we are quickened and nourished into life everlasting; and these propose unto us no invisible pains of hell, but the body of Christ wounded, and his blood shed, for the remitting of our sins, and uniting us unto Christ, that we may be "members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones" (Eph. v.)

Yea, what an unthankful part were it for the captives that are enlarged, to challenge the ransom which was paid for their freedom as defective, when the adversary from whom we were bought received it, by the rule of God's justice, as a price most sufficient for us all that were delivered. "I will redeem them from the power of hell, I will ransom them from death" (saith God by his prophet). "You were bought with a price" (saith Paul). The price, then, which Christ paid must be fully worth the thing redeemed. For since it pleased God not by force to take us from Satan, but with a price to buy us out of his hands, it were dishonour to God, and a kind of reproach, to give less for us than might countervail us; and, therefore, let us rest assured, that the price which Christ paid for us was of far greater value than we were; not only in the upright judgment of God, but even in the malicious and furious desire of Satan, who thirsted after the blood of the Son of God with greedier jaws than after all the world besides, and triumphed more in bringing him to a shameful death than in the destruction of all the faithful: wherefore the wisdom and justice of God suffered him to shew his rage on the flesh of Christ, and as it were to trample in his blood, which he spilt like water on the earth, and left him that which he so eagerly pursued, and, in his malice against God's glory, preferred before all the world, as a full payment for all those that should be delivered by the death of Christ. And for this cause the blood of Christ is called, by

the Holy Ghost, the price of our redemption. "Ye were redeemed (saith Peter) with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb unspotted and undefiled" (1 Peter, i.) Yea, the song which the saints in heaven do sing unto the Lamb is this: "Thou wast killed, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood" (Rev. v.)

When I say the blood of Christ was the price wherewith God redeemed us out of Satan's power, I do not mean that God made any contract with Satan, or took his consent to exchange, much less that Christ did proffer his blood to the devil to set us free. It were an injury to Christ for us to think his blood was shed to "satisfy the devil," as Gregory Nazianzen well observeth in his "*Oratio de Paschate*:" but Christ offered his blood as a sacrifice to God his Father, to verify the judgment pronounced against us—"Thou shalt die the death" (Gen. ii.)—and to satisfy the justice of God, provoked with our sins; yet, in coming to his death, since his life might not be ended, neither with his own hand nor by the hand of his Father, the wisdom of God "delivered him into the hands of sinners" (Mark xiv.), by whose blind zeal and bloody rage, the devil, that worketh in the children of disobedience, conspired and compassed his death, and with all manner of contumely and cruelty abused his body and spilt his blood, insulting at him by the mouths of the wicked, and rejoicing in the conquest he gat over Christ in bringing him to a reproachful death. But this extreme rage of Satan against the person of Christ turned to the utter ruin of his own kingdom: for God did not only raise again the Lord Jesus from death, as dying innocent, without all desert of death, but in recompense of the wrong which he received at Satan's hands, to the which he willingly submitted himself, God gave him power to spoil the kingdom of the devil, and to deliver all that ever did or should believe in his death and passion. And in this sort Christ bought us with his precious blood from the danger of sin and hell; not offering, but suffering Satan, by the hands of the Jews, to take his life from him; neither compounding with his adversary, but repressing him in the midst of his malice, who, assaulting Christ Jesus our head, as he had done all the members, was overthrown by him, and vanquished with an everlasting victory.

"*Mortuus est volens, ut involuntarié mortuos exsuscitaret. Devoravit ipsum mors ignorans, ubi devorasset, cognovit quem non devoravit. Devoravit unum cum omnibus; perdidit omnes propter unum. Rapuit ut leo; confracti sunt dentes ipsius*" (Basil *Oration. in fine Epistolarum*)—Christ died willingly (saith Basil), that he might raise those which died against their wills. Death ignorantly devoured him, which, when he had done, he knew whom he had not devoured. He swallowed up one as he

did all; and for that one he lost all. He seized on him as a lion, but his teeth were therewith broken.—The creed extant, under the name of Ruffinus: “*Sacramentum carnis susceptæ hanc habet causam, ut divina filii Dei virtus velut hamus quidam, habitu humanæ carnis obtectus principem mundi invitare posset ad Agonem, cui ipsi carnem suam velut escam tradens, hamo cum divinitatis intrinsecus teneret insertus ex profusione immaculati sanguinis*” (*Symbolum Ruffini tomo Hieronymi iv.*)—The mystery of Christ taking flesh was to this end, that the divine power of the Son of God covered, as a hook, under the shew of man’s flesh, might provoke the prince of this world to assault him; to whom (Christ) delivering his flesh as a bait, held fast (the devil) with the hook of his divinity sticking in him, through the shedding of his immaculate blood.—“*Condito rem omnium Satanæ manui traditum, quis vel desipiens credat? Sed tamen edoctus veritate quis nesciat;—cum se pro nostra redemptione Dominus membrorum Satanæ manibus tradidit (quod), ejusdem Satanæ manum in se sævire permittit, ut unde ipse exterius occumberet, inde nos exterius interiusque liberaret?*” (*Gregor. Moralium, lib. iii., cap. xi.*)—That the Maker of all was delivered into the hand of Satan, who is so foolish as to believe? And yet who taught by the truth is ignorant, that when the Lord, for our redemption, yielded himself into their hands that were the members of Satan, he suffered the hand of Satan to rage against him; that whence he outwardly died (in body), thence he might both outwardly and inwardly deliver us? And therefore he concludeth, “*Cum corpus ejus ad passionem accipit; electos ejus à jure suæ potestatis amittit*” (*Gregor. Moralium, lib. iii., cap. xi.*)—When (Satan) received the body (of Christ) to crucify it, he lost the elect of Christ from subjection to his power.

St. Austen, shewing how Christ conquered the devil, first by justice and then by power, saith: “*Placuit Deo, ut propter eruendum hominem de diaboli potestate, non potentiâ diabolus sed justitiâ vinceretur*” (*August. de Trinitate, lib. xiii., cap. xiii.*)—It pleased God, for the delivering of man out of the devil’s power, that the devil should be conquered by justice, and not by might.—“*Quæ est igitur justitia, quæ victus est diabolus? Quæ nisi justitia Jesu Christi? Et quomodo victus est? Quia cum in eo nihil morte dignum invenit, occidit eum tamen: et utique justum est, ut debitores quos tenebat, liberi dimittantur, in eum credentes, quem sine ullo debito occidit. Hoc est quod justificari dicimur in sanguine Christi*” (*August. de Trinitate, lib. xiii., cap. xiii.*)—What, then, is the justice whereby the devil was conquered? What but the justice of Jesus Christ? And how? Because that when the devil found in Christ nothing worthy of

death, he killed him notwithstanding: and surely justice requireth that the debtors which Satan held should be set free, believing in him whom Satan slew without any debt. This is it that we are said to be justified in the blood of Christ.—“Sanguis enim ille quoniam ejus erat qui nullum habuit omnino peccatum, ad remissionem nostrorum fusus est peccatorum; ut quia eos diabolus merito tenebat, quos peccatores conditione mortis obstrinxit, hos per eum meritò dimitteret, quem nullius peccati reum immerito pœna mortis affecit: hâc justitiâ victus, et hoc vinculo vinctus est fortis, ut vasa ejus eriperentur” (August. Trinitate, lib. xiii., cap. xv.)—For that blood, because it was his who was utterly void of sin, was shed for the remission of our sins; that whom the devil justly held as guilty of sin, and obnoxious to death, those he might worthily loose through him whom he wrongfully slew, being guilty of no sin. With this justice the devil was conquered, and with this band was he bound, that his goods might be spoiled.—And so St. Austen concludeth in express words, that “the blood of Christ, which the devil was permitted to shed by the hands of the wicked, was given as a price in our redemption;” which when the devil had spilt, it was reckoned to him as a ransom for us, since Christ owed none for himself; and so were we dismissed out of his power. “In hâc redemptione tanquam pretium pro nobis datus est Christi sanguis, quo accepto diabolus non ditatus, sed ligatus est, ut nos ab ejus nexibus solveremur” (August. Trinitate, lib. xiii., cap. xv.)—In this redemption the blood of Christ was given as a ransom for us, which being received, the devil was not enriched, but concluded, that we might be loosed from his snares. St. Ambrose affirmeth as much: “Si redempti sumus non corruptibilibus argento et auro, sed precioso sanguine Domini nostri Jesu Christi (quo utique vendente nisi eo qui nostrum jam peccatricis successionis ære quæsitum servitium possidedat), sine dubio ipse flagitabat pretium ut servitio exueret quos tenebat obstrictos. Pretium autem nostræ liberationis erat sanguis Domini Jesu, quod necessario solvendum erat ei, cui peccatis nostris venditi eramus” (Ambrose, lib. ix., epist. lxxvii.)—If we be redeemed not with corruptible things, as silver and gold, but with the precious blood of our Lord Jesus Christ (who selling us, but he that possessed us as his servants, by reason of our sinful succession), doubtless even he required a ransom to dismiss us from the servitude which he had over us. Now the price of our deliverance was the blood of our Lord Jesus, which (price) was necessary to be paid to him, to whom we were sold through our sins.—They which traduce this doctrine, as inclining to Manicheism, had more need of Elleborus to purge their brains than of authorities to persuade their hearts. For

since Christ paid no ransom for himself, but for us, and his innocent blood could not be shed but by the hands of the wicked, what touch of untruth can it have, that God accounted the blood of Christ to be of more value than all the sons of men; and, consequently, that which the devil eagerly thirsted and wrongfully shed, to be reputed as man's ransom, and a price most sufficient for all the world? Yea, the Scripture, which is the word of truth, doth not only teach us who redeemed us, and with what price, as "God bought his Church with his own blood" (Acts xx.), but, in manifest words, from whom we were redeemed, even "from the power of darkness, death, and hell" (Col. i.); that, "being delivered out of the hands of our enemies, we should serve God without fear, in holiness and righteousness, all the days of our life" (Hos. xiii. and Luke i.)

Whether, therefore, we resemble the body and blood of Christ to a prey that broke the teeth of the devourer, to a bait that held fast the swallower, to a price that concluded the challenger, to a ransom that freed the prisoner, or to a conquest that overthrew the insulter—in effect it is all one: Satan, by killing him that was the Author of life, lost both him and all his members; the Lord rising again by his own power, and raising them all that could not be severed from him, by the might and merit of his death and suffering. And so the godly which now live on the earth are "not their own" (1 Cor. vi.), but his that bought them with a price; being before sold (Rom. vii.) under sin, whose servants (Rom. vi.) they were, till Christ with his blood redeemed them unto God (Rev. v.), and made them kings and priests to God his Father. "Venit Redemptor et dedit pretium, fudit sanguinem suum, emit orbem terrarum. Videte quid dederit, et invenite quid emerit. Sanguis Christi pretium est, tanti quid valet? Quid nisi totus orbis? Quid nisi omnes gentes?" (August. in Ps. xcv.)—The Redeemer came (saith Austen) and paid the price; he shed his blood and purchased the world. Consider what he gave, and mark what he bought. The blood of Christ was the price;—what was valued at so great a price? What but the whole world? What but all the nations of the earth?—"Hic sanguis effusus omnem terrarum orbem abluit, hic sanguis antea semper præsignabatur in sacrificijs, in justorum cædibus. Hic orbis terrarum est pretium. Hoc Christus emit ecclesiam. Hoc eam omnem adornavit" (Chrysost. ad popul. Antioch, homil. lxi.)—This blood (saith Chrysostom) being shed, washed the whole world. This blood was ever before figured in the sacrifices and martyrdoms of the righteous. This blood is the price of the world; with this Christ bought his Church; with this he wholly adorned it.—"Christus non esset condignum pretium totius creaturæ redimendæ, neque sufficeret

ad bene redimendam mundi vitam, etiamsi suam deponeret animam ut pretium pro nobis, ac etiam pretiosum sanguinem, nisi vere esset filius, et tanquam ex Deo Deus" (Cyril Dialog. de Trinitate, lib. iv.)—Christ had not been a just price (saith Cyril) to redeem all creatures, nor sufficient to purchase the life of the world, though he would have laid down his life, and his precious blood, as a ransom for us, if he had not been the true Son of God, and, as it were, God of God.—Whereas now, "Unus dignitate universos superans, pro omnibus mortuus est, et quæcunq sub cœlo sunt sanguine suo redemit, Deo que et patri universæ terræ habitatores acquisivit" (Cyril, tom. ii., epist. i.)—He alone, exceeding all other in worth and value, died for all, and by his blood redeemed all things under heaven, and purchased to God his Father the inhabitants of the whole earth.

But our Saviour saith, the Son of Man came—"dare animam suam redemptionem pro multis"—to give his soul a ransom for many (Matt. xx.) And Isaiah foretold as much, that he should "make his soul an offering for sin" (Isaiah liii.) It is no great mastery to cite places of Scripture in shew repugnant one to the other; howbeit, in truth these are not contrarieties, but consequents to the former authorities. For where the soul of man is the life of his body, Christ could not die for our sins, but he must lay down his soul to death that it might be separated from his body; and so give his soul, that is, his life, a ransom for many and an offering for sin: and so the very translators, that otherwise favour this opinion of hell pains, do interpret those words: "The Son of Man came not to be served, but to serve, and give his life a ransom for many" (Matt. xx.) And the like elsewhere: "Bonus pastor dat animam pro ovibus"—the good shepherd giveth his life for his sheep; "Animam meam pono pro ovibus meis"—I lay down my life for my sheep; "Diligit me pater quia pono animam meam, ut iterum sumam eam"—my Father loveth me because I lay down my life to take it again (John x.) And, indeed, that phrase, "ponere animam," in the Scriptures, doth always note a voluntary yielding of the life, which is a laying aside of the soul for the love of others; as where Peter saith, "Ponam animam meam pro te" (John xiii.), he did not mean he would go to hell for his Master—there was no cause nor need thereof—but "I will lay down my life for thee." And when St. John telleth us, "Quoniam ille animam suam posuit pro nobis, et nos debemus animas ponere pro fratribus" (1 John, iii.), he doth not charge us to hazard our souls, by sin or hell, for others, but insomuch as Christ gave his life for us, we ought to give our lives for our brethren. So that for Christ to lay aside his soul, or to pour it out unto death, was not to suffer hell pains for our sakes, but to die for our sins; and all those places are rather

coherent than diffident to the rest of the Scriptures which I alleged.

And yet because the ancient Fathers sometimes say that Christ gave his soul for our souls, as he did his flesh for our flesh, and the Scriptures often affirm he gave himself, I will come to the third effect of Christ's cross, which is the mighty power of his death; and there examine what part of Christ died for our sins, and how by his death the guilt of sin, the curse of the law, the sting of death, and the strength of Satan, are not only weakened and wasted, but extinguished and abolished, that they shall never prevail against him or his elect.

That the Son of God loved us and gave (Gal. ii.) himself for us, making the purgation of our sins in his (Heb. i.) own person, by the (Heb. ix.) sacrifice of himself to put away sin, is a case so clear that it need not to be proved, much less may be doubted without apparent subversion of the Christian faith; but whether Christ suffered the death of the whole man, his soul tasting, for the time, an inward and spiritual death in satisfaction of our sins, as his flesh did an external and corporal dissolution of nature, this, by some men, is questioned in our days. That for our sakes he humbled himself, and was obedient unto death, even the death of the cross, is out of all doubt; the Evangelists describe the manner of his death—the Apostles the cause; to wit, the redemption of our sins, the confirmation of the New Testament, the reconciliation of man to God, the destruction of him that was ruler of death, and the imitation of his obedience “who suffered for us, leaving an example that we should follow his steps” (1 Pet. iii.) All this he performed with the death of his flesh, the Scriptures nowhere mentioning any other kind of death, that I can read. Where a testament is, there must be the death of him that made the testament; for the testament is confirmed when men are dead. Christ is the Mediator of the New Testament, that through death, which was for the redemption of the trespasses in the former Testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance. This plainly expresseth the death of the body: for God forbid men's testaments should be frustrate till their souls have tasted the second death; but from the death of the body all testaments take their force: wherefore the New Testament is confirmed by the bodily death of Christ, and there need no pains of hell before it can be good. “You that in times past were strangers and enemies in mind, by evil works, hath he now reconciled in the body of his flesh, through death, to make you holy, undefiled, and faultless before him” (Col. i.) Paul thought it not enough to say, “We were reconciled unto God by the death of his Son;” but that death, he addeth, was in the body of his flesh, to exclude all supposals

of the death of the soul ; since the blood of Christ's cross did pacify things in earth and in heaven. "For so much as the children were partakers of flesh and blood, he also did therein partake with them, that through death he might destroy him that had power of death, even the devil" (Heb. ii.) The death of the spirit may be without flesh and blood, as we see in the devils who are dead in spirit. But Christ took flesh and blood, that by the death of his flesh he might destroy the devil, that insulted and reigned over the weakness of man's flesh. "We are buried (with Christ) by baptism into his death, and if we be grafted with him into the similitude of his death, we shall be likewise into his resurrection : knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin ; for he that is dead is freed from sin" (Rom. vi.) So many words, so many reasons, to prove that Christ died not for us the death of the soul, but only of the body. We are buried with him by baptism : his body, not his soul, was buried. We are grafted into the similitude of his death : not the soul, but sin dieth in us when we are grafted into Christ, for he quickeneth our spirits. Our old man was crucified with him : his soul was not crucified, but his flesh. That the body of sin might be destroyed : by the death of the soul the body of sin is strengthened and increased. That henceforth we should not serve sin : they must needs serve sin whose souls are dead with sin. He that is dead is freed from sin ; but he that is dead in spirit is subjected to the force and fury of sin. The death of Christ, then, is mentioned nowhere in the Scriptures, but the very words or circumstances do clearly confirm that they speak of the death which he suffered for us on the cross, in the body of his flesh.

That Christ did or could suffer the death of the soul, is a position far from the words, but farther from the grounds, of the sacred Scriptures : for in God there is no death, and without God there is no life of the soul. So that it is neither possible for the soul joined with God to die, nor for the soul separated from God to live. Then if Christ's soul were at any time dead, it lost all conjunction and communion with God ; and, consequently, the personal union of God and man in Christ was for that time dissolved, and the grace and presence of God's Spirit were utterly taken from him ; and so, during that space, there could be in Christ neither obedience, humility, patience, holiness, nor love, which are the fruits of God's Spirit ; yea, the soul of Christ, if it were but for an hour deprived of God's grace and Spirit, must needs, for that time, be subjected to all sin and wickedness, which the devil himself dare not avouch of the soul of Christ. Men may do well, therefore, to beware how they ven-

ture unadvisedly to say that Christ suffered the death of the soul ; for howsoever they may frame unto themselves a new kind of death in the soul of Christ, as they think far from these absurdities and blasphemies, yet both Scriptures and Fathers mightily contradict that loose, if not lewd, assertion. “With thee is the fountain of life” (Ps. xxxvi.), saith David to God. Then if the soul of Christ were always joined with God, or so much as in God’s favour, it must needs have life ; for “in (God’s) favour there is life” (Ps. xxx.) ; yea, the presence of God’s Spirit giveth life. “*Spiritus est qui vivificat*”—it is the Spirit that quickeneth (John vi.), saith our Saviour ; and Paul citeth the same words (2 Cor. iii.) Where, then, the Spirit of God is, there is life ; and, consequently, the soul that is dead is deprived of God’s Spirit. Now from whom the Spirit of God is departed, in him must needs want all the fruits of God’s Spirit ; and so the soul that is dead (*h*) is excluded from all godliness and virtue : for these are not only signs, but effects of God’s Spirit working in the soul of man. And since between righteousness and unrighteousness there is no middle, the soul of man wanting light, truth, and sanctity, of force must be filled with darkness, error, and iniquity ; which to surmise in the soul of Christ is the height of all impiety. “As many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God” (Rom. viii.) If Christ’s soul wanted at any time the Spirit of God, he was not the Son of God. If he ever and always had the Spirit of life dwelling in him, his soul could at no time be dead ; for the “Spirit is life through righteousness” (Rom. viii.) But why seek we proofs that Christ’s soul could not die, since he himself is the author and giver of life ? “I am the way, the truth, and the life” (John xiv.), saith our Saviour. “He that believeth in me hath everlasting life” (John vi.) “I am the resurrection and the life ; he that believeth in me, though he were dead, he shall live. And he that liveth and believeth in me shall never die” (John xi.) If the soul of him that believeth in Christ shall never die, how could Christ himself at any time die in soul ? “Christ is our life” (Col. iii.) : how, then, shall we be sure never to die, if the fountain of our life, in Christ’s person, might for the time be dried up with death ? Shall we have fuller or perfecter fruition of life than Christ Jesus our head, who “giveth life to all his sheep ?” (John x.) But he had so plentiful, perpetual, and personal possession of life, not only for himself, but for us all, that the Apostle saith, “the first Adam was made a living soul, the last Adam was made a quickening spirit” (1 Cor. xv.) ; that is, not only to have life in himself, but to give life to others. Could he, then, at any time be a dead soul whom the Holy Ghost affirmeth to be made a quickening spirit ? Could he give that to others which himself did

lack, or lose that which he once had? I know to give life is proper to God, and for that cause the soul of Christ could not have that power by creation, but by conjunction with his Godhead; and, in that respect, was the receptacle whereby the life and grace of his divine nature was derived into his human, with such abundance and assurance, that of his “fulness we all have received” (John i.); insomuch that “the words which he spake were spirit and life” (John vi.), and the flesh which he took was “the bread of life;” yea, the body of Christ dying did not only resist and repress the force of death, but, rising again, destroyed death, and restored life to the world. If the temple of his body were stronger than death, what was the sanctuary of his soul?

I wish, therefore, all men that profess themselves Christians to be soberly minded, and, with the learned and ancient Fathers, to acknowledge, that there is not mentioned in the Scriptures any death of the soul besides sin and eternal damnation; neither of the which, with any moderation or mitigation, can be attributed to Christ without shameful blasphemy. “*Anima peccans ipsa morietur*”—The soul that sinneth, that soul shall die (Ezek. xviii.) In these words are both deaths of the soul expressed: the first, voluntary, when for the delights of sin we refuse the precepts of God; the other, necessary, when God by his justice withdraweth his presence from us, and executeth his vengeance on us that never shall have end. That sin is a death of the soul, cannot be denied. “Let the dead bury their dead (saith Christ to one of his disciples), follow thou me” (Matt. viii.): which must needs be meant of such as are living in body and dead in soul; as Paul speaketh of wanton widows: “She which liveth in pleasure is dead while she liveth” (1 Tim. v.) These the Scripture calleth “dead in sin.” “When we were dead by sins, God quickened us together with Christ” (Eph. ii.) And again: “You which were dead in sins hath he quickened together with Christ, forgiving you all your trespasses” (Col. ii.) From this death I make no doubt but all Christian men, with heart and voice, will clearly discharge the “unspotted and undefiled Lamb of God, who did no sin, neither was there any guile found in his mouth” (1 Pet. i. & ii.)

The other kind of the death of the soul, which is damnation, must be farther from Christ than ever was sin; for not only Christ’s innocency should be unjustly condemned, which were altogether repugnant to God’s righteousness, but the Son of God wronged, and man’s salvation wholly subverted. Nothing might befall the human nature of Christ which was unfitting for his divine; both being joined in one person. And if our Saviour were condemned to hell, which way shall we think to escape the

just and fearful judgment of God for our manifold and grievous sins? He was, indeed, condemned by man, that gave wrongful sentence of death against him, but he was acquitted of God; and, because he humbled himself to the death of the cross, "God highly exalted him, and gave him a name above all names" (Phil. ii.), as well in witness of his innocency as in reward of his humility. Yea, the Holy Ghost, which evidently recordeth Christ's "assurance, confidence, and rejoicing in God" (Ps. xvi.), as he hung on the cross, clean excludeth all suspicion that he suffered the death of the soul; for the soul, in this life, can have no fuller nor faster coherence with God than Christ had. And, since God is the true life of the soul, the inseparable conjunction of Christ's soul with God proveth a continual persuasion and fruition of eternal life, which by no means admitteth any danger or doubt, much less any sense or sufferance of the second death being the just wages of sin, whereby the wicked are everlastingly punished. "*Certe anima Christi non solum immortalis secundum cæterarum naturam, sed etiam nullo mortificata peccato, vel damnatione punita est: quibus duabus causis mors animæ intelligi potest*" (August., epist. lxi.)—Surely the soul of Christ (saith Austen) was not only immortal in nature as the rest, but was neither dead with any sin, nor punished with damnation; which two ways the death of the soul may be understood.—If, then, neither transgression nor damnation may be ascribed to the soul of Christ, it is evident he suffered not the death of the soul; yea, to subject the soul of Christ to either of these two deaths, which only are the deaths of the soul, were more horrible blasphemy than I hope any Christian man meaneth to incur.

But do I mistake the death of the soul? I must confess I therein follow the sacred Scriptures and ancient Fathers; other kind of death of the soul I know none, because I read none justly proved. These two are manifest in the Scriptures. That sin killeth the soul, besides many other places before cited, St. Paul shortly sheweth in these words: "Sin revived, but I died; for sin deceived me and slew me" (Rom. vii.) And likewise our Saviour: "Except you believe, you shall die in your sins" (John viii.) That everlasting death is the wages of sin, I take it to be as clear a case as the former. "These shall go into everlasting punishment" (Matt. xxv.), saith Christ to the wicked. "They shall be punished with everlasting perdition" (2 Thes. i.), saith Paul of the ignorant and disobedient. "The smoke of their torments shall ascend evermore" (Rev. xiv.), saith John in his Revelation. "The lake burning with fire and brimstone, this is the second death" (Rev. xx.) How the ancient Fathers define the death of the soul is soon seen by their writings: "*Dicam audacter*

fratres sed tamem verum. Duæ vitæ sunt, una corporis, altera animæ, sicut vita corporis anima, sic vita animæ Deus. Quomodo si anima deserat, moritur corpus; sic moritur anima si deserat Deus" (August. in Ps. lxx.)—I will speak boldly (saith Austen), but truly. There are two sorts of life, one of the body, another of the soul. As the soul is the life of the body, so God is the life of the soul; and as if the soul depart the body dieth, so dieth the soul if God forsake it.—"Mors proprie non est ea, quæ animam à corpore, sed quæ animam à Deo separat. Deus vita est, qui a Deo separatur, mortuus est" (Cyril, homil. x., de Exitu Animæ)—That is not properly death (saith Cyril) which severeth the soul from the body, but that which severeth the soul from God. God is life; and, therefore, he that is separated from God is dead.—"Anima quæ peccat moritur, non utique aliqua sui dissolutione, sed merito moritur Deo, quia vivit peccato. Ergo quæ non peccat, non moritur" (Ambrose de Bono Mortis, cap. ix.)—The soul which sinneth dieth (saith Ambrose), not by any dissolution of her substance, but worthily dieth she unto God, because she liveth unto sin. The soul, then, which sinneth not, dieth not.—"Anima in corpore vita est carnis; Deus vero quia vivificat omnia, vita est animarum" (Gregory, in Ezek., homil. xvii.) "Sicut mors exterior ab anima dividit carnem, ita mors interior à Deo separat animam" (Gregory, *Moralium*, lib. ix., cap. xxxviii.)—The soul in the body (saith Gregory) is the life of the flesh, but God that quickeneth all things is the life of the soul. As the outward death divideth the body from the soul, so the inward death divideth the soul from God.—"Sicut anima vita est corporis, ita Deus vita est animæ. Mors animæ separatio à Deo; mors corporis separatio animæ à corpore" (Bernard Serm. Paru. iii., et aliis Serm. Paru. num. vii.)—As the soul is the life of the body, so God is the life of the soul (saith Bernard). The death of the soul is to be separated from God; the death of the body is the departure of the soul from the body.—Neither do I see how this definition of the death of the soul can be avoided or amended: for can there be life from any other, but only from God? If it be good, it must come from the fountain of all goodness; and "none is good but only God" (Luke xviii.) Then, the soul which is partaker of God is partaker of life; and to be severed from God is to be severed from life: which is the true description of death.

Rightly, therefore, do the ancient Fathers teach, that Christ, dying for our sins, suffered only the death of the body, but not of the soul; and the Scriptures, wheresoever they mention the death of Christ, must have the like construction: for the soul of Christ could not die so long as it had the presence and assistance of God's Spirit; yea, we leave him neither faith nor hope, love nor

joy, obedience nor patience, nor any other merits or virtues, if we subject him to the death of the soul; for these are the buds and fruits of life: from which, if we cannot exclude the soul of Christ, no, not for a moment, without sacrilegious impiety, it remaineth that Christ neither suffered nor tasted the death of the soul, but only the death of the body. "In his body he bare our sins on the tree" (1 Peter, ii.), and "reconciled us unto God in the body of his flesh, through death, when we were strangers and enemies in heart, by reason of our evil works" (Col. i.) "Quid est enim quod vivificatus est spiritu, nisi quod eadem caro qua sola fuerat mortificatus vivificante spiritu resurrexit? Nam quod animâ fuerat mortificatus Jesus, hoc est eo spiritu, qui hominis est, quis audeat dicere, cum mors animæ non sit nisi peccatum, à quo ille omnino immunis fuit? Mortificatus ergo carne dictus est, quia secundum solam carnem mortuus est" (August., epist. xcix.)—What is meant by this, that Christ was quickened in spirit, but that the same flesh, in which only he died, rose again quickened by the Spirit? For that Jesus was dead in spirit who dare avouch—I mean in his human spirit—since as the death of the soul is nothing but sin, from which he was altogether free?—And, lest we should think this slipped his pen, elsewhere he largely and learnedly handleth the same matter: "(Diabolus) per impietatem mortuus est in spiritu, carne utique mortuus non est: nobis autem et impietatem persuasit, et per hanc ut in mortem carnis venire mereremur effecit. Quò ergo nos Mediator mortis transmisit, et ipse non venit, hoc est ad mortem carnis: ibi nobis Dominus Deus noster medicinam emendationis inseruit quam ille non meruit" (August. de Trinitate, lib. iv., cap. xii.)—By sin the devil died in spirit—in flesh he died not: but to us he persuaded sin, and thereby brought us to deserve the death of the flesh. Whither, then, the Mediator of death cast us, and came not himself—that is, to the death of the body—even there the Lord our God appointed a medicine to cure us, which the devil never obtained.—And, noting the remedy provided for us in the bodily death of Christ, he saith: "Vitæ Mediator ostendens, quam non sit mors timenda, quæ per humanam conditionem jam evadi non potest, sed potius impietas quæ per fidem caveri potest occurrit nobis ad finem quo venimus, sed non qua venimus. Nos enim ad mortem per peccatum venimus, ille per justitiam; et ideo cum sit mors nostra pœna peccati, mors illius facta est hostia pro peccato" (August. de Trinitate, lib. iv., cap. xii.)—The Mediator of life (Christ Jesus), to shew us that death is not to be feared, which, by human condition, can now not be escaped, but rather impiety, which by faith may be avoided—met us in the end whither we were come, but not in the way by which we came: for we came, by sin, to death,

but he by righteousness ; and so, where our death is the punishment of sin, his death is the sacrifice for sin.—And, therefore, the death which Christ suffered in his body on the cross, did purge, abolish, and extinguish, all our sins ; whereby the power of Satan justly detained us to abide the punishment of our transgressions. “*Quia vinum spiritu mortuus spiritu non invasit, quoquo modo avidus mortis humanæ convertit se ad faciendam mortem quam potuit ; et permissus est in illud, quod ex nobis mortale vinus Mediator acceperat : et ubi potuit aliquid facere, ibi omni ex parte devictus est, et unde accepit exterius potestatem dominicæ carnis occidendæ, inde interior ejus potestas, quâ nos tenebat, occisa est. Factum est enim, ut vincula peccatorum multorum in multis mortibus per unius unam mortem, quam peccatum nullum præcesserat, solverentur. Ita diabolus hominem in ipsa morte carnis amisit*” (August. de Trinitate, lib. iv., cap. xiii.)—Because (the devil) dead in spirit could not invade (Christ) living in spirit ; as most desirous to kill man, he fastened on that death which he could compass, and was suffered to kill that mortal (body) which the living Mediator took from mankind ; and where he could do anything, even there was he every way conquered ; and whence he received outwardly power to kill the Lord’s body, thence was his inward power, whereby he held us, overthrown : by which it came to pass, that the chains of many sins, deserving many deaths, were loosed by the one death of one in whom was no sin. So the devil lost man by the very death of (Christ’s) flesh.—Yea, the death of Christ should lead us patiently to suffer the same death for him which he suffered for us. “*Hactenus morerentur ad Christi gratiam pertinentes, quatenus pro illis ipse mortuus est Christus, carnis tantum morte non spiritus*” (August. de Trinitate, lib. xi., cap. xv.)—So far should they, which belong to the grace of Christ, die, as Christ died for them ; that is, the death of the body only, and not of the spirit.—And by that death of his body, he freed us from both. “*Solius corporis mortem Dei filius pro nobis accepit, per quam à nobis et dominationem peccati, et pœnam æternæ punitionis exclusit*” (August. de Tempore, serm. clxii.)—The death of the body only, the Son of God suffered for us ; by which he delivered us both from the dominion of sin and from eternal damnation.

Cyrillus teacheth the same doctrine : “*Si intelligatur Deus incarnatus, et propria carne passus, parva est erga ipsum omnis creatura, et sufficit ad redemptionem mundi unius carnis mors*” (Cyril, de Recta fide ad Reginas, lib. ii.)—If we understand (Christ) to be God incarnate, and to have suffered in his own flesh, of small value in respect of him are all creatures, and sufficient to redeem the world is the death of his only flesh.

And likewise Gregory: “*Nos quia mente a Deo recessimus, et carne ad pulverem redimus, pœna duplæ mortis astringimur. Sed venit ad nos qui sola carne pro nobis moreretur, et simplam suam duplæ nostræ jungeret et nos ab utraque morte liberaret*” (Greg. Moral., lib. ix., cap. xv.)—Because in heart we were departed from God, and in flesh returning to dust, we are tied to the punishment of a double death. But (Christ) came unto us, which died in the flesh only for us, and joining his one kind of death to both ours, delivered us from both.—And more at large, the same Father, debating the same matter: “*Umbra mortis mors carnis accipitur quia sicut vera mors est, qua anima separatur à Deo, ita umbra mortis est, qua caro separatur ab anima. Quos enim constat non spiritu sed sola carne mori, nequaquam se vera morte, sed umbra mortis dicunt operiri. Quid est ergo quod beatus Job postulat umbram mortis nisi quod ad delenda peccata ante Dei oculos, Dei et hominum Mediatorem requirit, qui solam pro nobis mortem carnis susciperet, et veram mortem delinquentium, per umbram suæ mortis deleret? Ad nos quippe venit qui in morte spiritus carnisque tenebamur unam ad nos suam mortem detulit, et duas nostras, quas reperit solvit, si enim ipse utramque susciperet nos a nulla liberaret: sed unam misericorditer accepit, et juste utramque damnavit simplam suam duplæ nostræ contulit et duplam nostram moriens subegit. Qui ergo solam pro nobis mortem carnis suscepit umbram mortis pertulit, et a Dei oculis culpam quam fecimus, abscondit*” (Greg. Moral., lib. iv., cap. xvii.)—The shadow of death is taken for the death of the body; for that, as it is the true death, whereby the soul is separated from God, so it is but the shadow of death, whereby the body is separated from the soul. For they which assuredly die not the death of the spirit, but only of the flesh, they do not say they are covered with the true death, but with the shadow of death. To what end, then, doth blessed Job ask for the shadow of death, but that, to wipe away sin out of God’s sight, he seeketh for the Mediator of God and man, who should undertake for us the death of the body only, and by the shadow of his death might extinguish the true death of sinners? He came to us that were subject both to the death of the spirit and of the flesh, and by his single death he loosed both our deaths. If he should have suffered both, he could have delivered us from neither; but he mercifully undertook one of them, and justly condemned both. He joined his single death to our double death, and, dying, conquered both our deaths. He, then, which for us took upon him only the death of the body, suffered the shadow of death, and hid from God’s eyes the sin which we had committed.—

Bernard likewise : “Cum gemina morte secundum utramque naturam homo damnatus fuisset, altera quidem spiritali et voluntaria, altera corporali et necessaria; utrique Deus homo, una sua corporali ac voluntaria benigne et potenter occurrit, illaque sua una nostram utramque damnavit” (Bernard, ad Milit. Templi., cap. xi.)—Where man was condemned unto a double death—to wit, in either part of his nature; the one death spiritual and voluntary, the other corporal and necessary—God, being made man, did mightily and mercifully release both our deaths with his one corporal and voluntary death, and with that one death of his destroyed both ours.—And so concludeth : “Dum sponte, et tantum in corpore moritur, et vitam nobis et justitiam promeretur”—Whilst Christ died willingly, and only in his body, he merited for us both righteousness and life.

I hope, to all men learned or well-advised, it will seem no Jesuitical phrensy, but rather Christian and Catholic doctrine, that the Son of God, dying for our sins, suffered not the death of the soul, but only of the body, by the hands of the Jews; and by the bodily and bloody sacrifice of himself, did not only redeem and cleanse both our souls and bodies, but destroyed sin and death, purging our transgressions by the merit of his obedience, and swallowing up death by the power of his life. And howsoever the Scriptures sometimes affirm that he “gave himself a ransom for all men” (1 Tim. ii.); and the Fathers likewise teach that he gave his flesh for our flesh, and his soul for our souls; yet neither Scriptures nor Fathers have any meaning either to subject Christ to the death of the soul, which assertion they abhor as wicked, or to diminish the force or fruit of his bodily death, which they extol as most sufficient; but to express, that in the death of his flesh on the cross, his soul did suffer the sense of pain and smart of death, which parted the body and soul in sunder: and so, jointly with the body, and severally by itself, the soul of Christ had not only temptations, afflictions, and passions, but even endured the natural sting and sharpness of death, to which he submitted his soul that he might have the “feeling of our infirmities, and in all things be tempted as we are, but still without sin” (Heb. iv.) How Christ gave himself wholly for us, we may learn out of Bernard : “Sicut totum hominem saluum fecit, sic de toto se hostiam fecit salutarem: corpus exponens tantis suppliciis et injuriis, animam vero geminæ cujusdam humanissimæ compassionis affectui, inde super mœrore inconsolabili sanctarum feminarum, inde super desperatione et dispersione discipulorum. In his quatuor crux dominica fuit” (Bernard, in Amis Palmatum,

serm. iii.)—As Christ saved the whole man, so of himself wholly he made a wholesome sacrifice, yielding his body to so great torments and wrongs, and his soul to the feeling of a double most tender compassion—on the one side, for the uncomfortable grief of the holy women ; on the other side, for the desperation and dispersion of his disciples. In these four consisted the cross of Christ.—Since, then, the death of Christ did both affect and afflict his soul and his body, justly might Irenæus say, “ The Lord bought us with his own blood, and gave his soul for our souls, and his flesh for our flesh” (Irenæus, lib. v., cap. i.) For in dying, he laid down his soul not only to sorrow, grief, and pain, but even to the bitter divorce of death, that broke the communion of body and soul. “ Sicut totus semetipsum tradidit, et totus homo semetipsum obtulit, ita totus homo animam suam possuit, cum anima, in cruce moriente carne, discessit” (Fulgentius ad Trasimundum, lib. iii.)—As whole Christ gave himself (saith Fulgentius), and the whole man offered himself, so the whole man laid down his soul, when, the flesh dying on the cross, the soul departed.—So that Christ yielded his soul for our souls to the susception of sorrow, suffering of pain, and dissolution of nature ; but unto the death of the soul he did neither offer nor yield himself, since that is a separation from God and exclusion from grace, from which it was utterly impossible the soul of Christ could either willingly or forcibly, for an hour, be removed ; yea, where you find the suffering of his soul witnessed, there shall you see the death of his flesh only to be avouched.

“ Quia totum hominem Deus ille suscepit, ideo totius hominis in se passiones in veritate monstravit, et animam quidem rationalem habens, quicquid fuit infirmitatis animæ sine peccato suscepit et pertulit, ut dum humanæ animæ passiones, in anima quam accepit vinceret, nostras quoque animas ab infirmitatibus liberaret. Carnem quoque humanam accipiens, in ejusdem veritate carnis, veritatem voluntariæ habuit passionis, ut in carne mortuus totam in se hominis occideret mortem” (Fulgentius ad Trasimundum, lib. iii.)—Because (the Son of God) took unto him the whole nature of man, therefore he shewed in himself the sufferings of the whole man ; and having a reasonable soul, he took upon him and endured all the infirmities of the soul, but without sin ; that whilst in the soul which he took, he conquered the passions of man’s soul, he might free our souls also from infirmities. Taking likewise man’s flesh, in the truth of the same flesh he suffered a true and voluntary passion, that, dying in the flesh, he might kill in his person the whole death due to man.—Christ endured the passions of the whole man,

having neither body nor soul free from suffering; but yet he died only in the flesh, and thereby he killed the whole death inflicted on the body and soul of man. “*Quis ignorat Christum in solo corpore mortuum et sepultum?*” (Fulgentius ad Trasimundum, lib. iii.)—Who is ignorant that Christ in body only died, and was buried?—And again: “*Sicut in morte solius carnis immortalis fuit, sic in passionibus totius hominis impassibilis omnino permansit*” (Fulgentius ad Trasimundum, lib. iii.)—The Godhead of Christ was immortal when only his body died, and impassible when the whole man suffered. “*Moriente carne, non solum Deitas sed nec anima Christi potest ostendi commortua*” (Fulgentius ad Trasimundum, lib. iii.)—When Christ’s body died, not only his Deity, but his soul cannot be shewed to have been partaker of death.—Wherefore I easily admit the words of Nazianzen to be true: that every part in man is “sanctified by the like (in Christ)—our condemned flesh by his flesh, our soul by his soul, our understanding by his understanding” (Nazianzen, in Tract xlix. ad Cledonium). Yea, I dislike not the words of Cyril: “*Carnem suam in redemptionis pretium pro omnium carne dependit; et animam suam similiter pro omnium anima redemptionis pretium constituit, quamvis iterum revixerit, vita secundum naturam existens*” (Cyril, de Recta fide ad Theodosium)—Christ yielded his flesh as a ransom for the flesh of all men, and made his soul likewise a price to redeem the souls of all, though he were restored again to life, as being life by nature;—so long as we abuse not his words to maintain our fancies, impugning his general and settled doctrine, that “sufficient for the redemption of the world is the death of his flesh only” (Cyril, de Recta fide ad Reginas, lib. ii.); nor thereby take occasion to defend that his blood is not able to justify or sanctify the believers. “*Sanguine suo, hoc est suæ carnis sanguine justificat omnes in se credentes*” (Cyril, de Recta fide ad Reginas, lib. i.)—With his blood, that is, with the blood of his flesh, he justifieth all that believe in him. “*Si non alio modo salvandus erat mundus nisi in sanguine et corpore morti utiliter derelicto, quo pacto non necessarius verbo incarnationis modus ut justificet in sanguine suo credentes in se, et conciliet patri per mortem sui corporis?*” (Cyril, de Recta fide ad Reginas, lib. i.)—If the world might none other way be saved but by Christ’s leaving his body and blood unto death for our good, how was not the taking of flesh necessary for the Son of God, that by his blood he might justify such as believed in him, and by the death of his body reconcile them to God his Father? “*Quomodo sanguis communis hominis nos sanctos efficeret? Sed sanctificavit sanguis Christi. Deus*

igitur et non simpliciter homo ; Deus enim erat in carne, suo sanguine nos purificans" (Cyril, de Recta fide ad Reginas, lib. i.) —How could the blood of a common man make us holy? But the blood of Christ did sanctify us. He was, therefore, God, and not simply a man ; for he was God in flesh that cleansed us with his blood.

NOTES.

It has been observed, that the Reformation was a gradual work ; and this not only if we look to the era of Wickliff, but even if we confine our attention to that of Luther. One by one the abominations of Popery became evident ; one by one the pure truths of the Gospel started, as it were, into their true light. It was only when some particular tenet of the Roman Church became peculiarly oppressive to an individual, that, *in the beginning of the Lutheran Reformation*, that individual willingly placed himself in opposition to the reigning dogma. Luther himself was no exception ; and, sincere as his after life proved his convictions to be, he unquestionably began to open his eyes when his order was unjustly treated by the Pope, in the matter of the sale of indulgences. The *Anglican* Reformation had been at work ever since the days of Wickliff. The opinions of Rome were held grossly by the gross, and spiritually by the more refined ; ignorantly by the uneducated, and philosophically by the learned : nor could there have been much *vital* difference between the principles of Sir Thomas More and Cranmer, of Ridley and Cuthbert Tunstall. At the same time, the difference that did exist, if not *vital*, was at least *very important* : and the more so, as the time was now come when these principles must, on both sides, be brought into practice, and carried out to their extreme consequences.

Henry VIII. entered the field of controversy, animated, not by a love of truth, but by the lust of power ; seeking not so much to purify the Church, as to display his own ability ; not the benefit of religion, but the gratification of his own unhallowed passions. With a mind naturally acute, and a heart unnaturally hard, possessing but moderate scholarship (as certain relics of his latinity prove beyond a doubt), and at the same time entertaining the opinion that he was peculiarly qualified to decide in questions of scholastic divinity, the king attached himself with some eagerness to the study ; and gifted, as he undoubtedly was, with talents of a high order, he rendered considerable service to the Papal cause, which at first he espoused. But a new combination of circumstances enlisted his passions on the other side, and a rupture soon arose between the Pope and the "Defender of the Faith"—a rupture destined to be as permanent as it was complete. The controversial talents of Henry may safely be passed over in silence, though we are quite as likely to underrate as to overrate them ; but when a

king becomes a disputant, and possesses both the power and the inclination

“To burn both sides who dare contest his will ;”

when, moreover, his will is, that his theological sentiments should be received throughout his dominions, not only as law, but also as Gospel ; and when those theological sentiments were notoriously changing with every new theory, and every new gust of passion ; a new element is introduced into the calculation, and it becomes impossible to say in what way the contest will terminate. It was, however, by means of this wayward and impetuous monarch that God was pleased to spare this country from the evils of schism. Secularizing the mighty controversy of the day, by blending with it his own personal quarrel with the Pope, he drew after him the hierarchy by a claim stronger than that of a foreign, albeit a spiritual potentate. The choice was morally set before them—for England or for Rome ; and however they might cling to the Roman creed, and preserve the Roman discipline, they adhered for the most part to the king in his quarrel ; and from the time that Henry VIII. cast the eyes of unlawful love upon Anne Boleyn, from that very hour the dominion of the Pope in England, which had been always precarious and long declining, may be said to have actually terminated.

The Papal authority died, as it were, a natural death. No formal separation *then* took place between the two Churches, nor, indeed, could it have done so ; for, as we have already stated, the Roman creed and the Roman discipline were alike pursued. The people of England, as a mass, were ignorant and uneducated, and seem to have felt but little interest in the disputes which the learned carried on so furiously ; and, did we want proofs of this fact, they are furnished by the facility with which every caprice of the imperious sovereign was embraced by the nation : nor was it till many years after his death, that the body of the people appear to have first appreciated the importance of a sound religious faith. More than once or twice during his reign, and those of his children, the whole nation changed their creed at once, at the monarch's bidding. Yet, while we fully allow the natural consequences to which we are led by a fact like this, we must notice, first, the way in which the better informed among the people held the tenets of Rome, and then the natural effect which this produced on the minds of their inferiors. Previous to the Council of Trent, many of the grossest errors of Popery were matters merely of individual opinion : the Church had pronounced no authoritative decision upon them, and her members were, therefore, left at liberty either to reject or accept them, as seemed most correct to themselves. Of this privilege the Anglican Catholics availed themselves most fully, and a great latitude of opinion on all disputed points prevailed within that section of the Church universal. This being the case, it would naturally be expected that the inferior classes, though they understood the questions less, should, if those questions were fairly brought before them, be as various in their modes of decision. Now it was not until 1563, that the Council of Trent, after eighteen years' duration, terminated ; and by that time the Reformation was pretty well established in England. Hence, during its

whole course, there remained open to the people that latitude of opinion to which we have alluded. These perpetual changes were, therefore, more nominal than real, and the difference between a Papist and a Protestant might consist in points easily concealed.

Thus, then, while we lament the fact of the changes to and fro, we are hardly entitled to pass so severe a judgment on our ancestors as we should, had they been oscillating between *Tridentine Popery* and *Reformed Anglican Catholicism*.

While, however, the Council of Trent was enacting, as articles of faith, those disputed points which had hitherto been subjects for free discussion, the Anglican Reformers were gradually bringing to perfection their magnificent and purely apostolic system of faith and discipline. While the one body of divines was engaged in ripening Popery, the other body was maturing Catholicity. Setting aside, in a few instances, the judgment of the earlier Protestants, as rash, and savouring rather of hatred to Rome than of love for Christian truth, they yet, in the majority of cases, confirmed the decisions of their predecessors; and if the judgment of Jewel, and Hooker, and Sanderson, differ occasionally from those of Cranmer, and Hooper, and Latimer, it is merely the difference between the controversialist, warm with his subject, and the judge, who coolly reviews the discussion.

The relative position of the Romanist and the Reformer previous to 1545, was very different to that in which they stood subsequently to 1563. In the former period, a certain degree of oscillation might take place, in the judgments of many, between Rome and England. In the latter period, it was totally impossible; each communion had drawn its lines of demarcation more strongly: to join the one, it was necessary to believe implicitly *all* the absurdities of Popery; admission to the other could only be obtained by an equally unhesitating renunciation of them.

During the intervening period, the frame-work of the Anglican Church had been gradually consolidated: her articles had been raised, and her discipline regulated. We must not, therefore, expect to find the same accuracy in detail, the same clearness of conception, or the same logical completeness in the divines who flourished in England during the earlier period of the Reformation, as in those of the Elizabethan age: this we assuredly shall not find. But, on the other hand, we shall see those doctrines of the Gospel, which *to us* are primary, cleared from obscurity, defended against superstition, and set in a new and convincing light. It is in this point of view that we must regard the writings of Tyndale the martyr. He was a witness for great truths in a turbulent age; he defended those truths with great ability, and still greater energy; he supported them, with unwearied perseverance, against the most powerful antagonists; and finally he suffered martyrdom rather than betray them. If his style be occasionally coarse, and his arguments more remarkable for energy than courtesy, it must be remembered that his enemies sought rather to destroy than to confute him. And if we find, occasionally, statements in which we cannot fully recognize the voice of the Church, we must reflect, that the Anglican Church in his day was not Reformed, and that his prayer at the stake was, "*Lord, open the King of England's eyes!*"

(a) As touching the order and cause of our justification, we will that all bishops and preachers shall instruct and teach our people, committed by us to their spiritual charge, that this word justification signifieth remission of our sins, and our acceptation or reconciliation into the grace and favour of God ; that is to say, our perfect renovation in Christ.

Item, that sinners attain this justification by contrition, and faith joined with charity, after such sort and manner as we before mentioned and declared. Not as though our contrition or faith, or any works proceeding thereof, can worthily merit or deserve to attain the said justification. For the only mercy and grace of the Father, promised freely unto us for his Son's sake, Jesu Christ, and the merits of his blood and passion, be the only sufficient and worthy causes thereof. And yet that notwithstanding, to the attaining of the same justification, God requireth to be in us not only inward contrition, perfect faith and charity, certain hope and confidence, with all other spiritual graces and motions, which, as we said before, must necessarily concur in remission of our sins, that is to say, our justification ; but also he requireth and commandeth us, that, after we be justified, we must also have good works of charity and obedience towards God, in the observing and fulfilling outwardly of his laws and commandments. For although acceptation to everlasting life be conjoined with justification, yet our good works be necessarily required to the attaining of everlasting life. And we, being justified, be necessarily bound, and it is our necessary duty to do good works, according to the saying of St. Paul : " We be bound not to live according to the flesh and to fleshly appetites ; for, if we live so, we shall undoubtedly be damned : and contrary, if we will mortify the deeds of our flesh, and live according to the Spirit, we shall be saved : for whosoever be led by the Spirit of God, they be the children of God." And Christ saith : " If ye will come to heaven, keep the commandments." And St. Paul, speaking of evil works, saith : " Whosoever commit sinful deeds, shall never come to heaven." Wherefore we will, that all bishops and preachers shall instruct and teach our people, committed by us unto their spiritual charge, that God necessarily requireth of us to do good works commanded by him, and that not only outward and civil works, but also the inward spiritual motions and graces of the Holy Ghost ; that is to say, to dread and fear God, to love God, to have firm confidence and trust in God, to invoke and call upon God, to have patience in all adversities, to hate sin, and to have certain purpose and will not to sin again ; and such other like motions and virtues. For Christ saith : " We must not only do outward civil good works, but also we must have these foresaid inward spiritual motions, consenting and agreeable to the law of God."—*Articles of Religion*, 1536.

(b) Justification is not the office of man, but of God ; for man cannot justify himself by his own works, neither in part, nor in the whole ; for that were the greatest arrogancy and presumption of man that Antichrist could erect against God, to affirm, that a man might, by his own works, take away and purge his own sins, and so justify himself.—*Homily on Salvation*.

Todd adduces the following proof that the Homily on Salvation was written by Cranmer himself:—

“John Woolton, the nephew of the celebrated Alexander Nowell, was the author of several theological works in the reign of Elizabeth. He was a canon residentiary of the Church of Exeter, and afterwards bishop of that see. Wood describes him as “a person of great piety and reason, and an earnest assertor of conformity against the opposers thereof; for which he was blamed by many, but commended by more, after his death.” In 1576, not long before he was advanced to the prelacy, he published “The Christian Mannell, or the Life and Manners of True Christians,” 12mo. Herein he says, with manly eloquence, “What wee teache and thinke of Good Workes, those Homelies, written ‘in our Englishe tounge, of Salvation, Faith, and Workes, by that lyght and martyr of Christe’s Churche, Cranmer, Archebysshoppe of Canterburie, doo playne testifie and declare; which are buylt upon so sure a foundation, that no sycophant can deface them, nor sophyster confute them, whyle the worlde shall endure: unto whom I remytte the reader desyrous of an absolute dyscourse in this matter.” Living so very near the time when Cranmer flourished, of such distinguished character in the Church, and to this day not contradicted in his plain assertion, Bishop Woolton, therefore, appears to me an evidence, in this case, of indisputable authority.”—*Todd’s Doctrines of our Reformers.*

(c) And they which actually do sin after their baptism, when they convert and turn again to God unfeignedly, they are likewise washed by this sacrifice from their sins, in such sort, that there remaineth not any spot of sin that shall be imputed to their damnation.—*Homily on Salvation.*

Etiam illi justificatis perversè sentiunt, qui credunt illos, postquam justi semel facti sunt, in peccatum non posse incidere; aut si fortè quicquam eorum faciunt quæ Dei legibus prohibentur, ea Deum pro peccatis non accipere. Quibus opinione contrarii, sed impietate pares sunt, qui quodcunque peccatum mortale quod post baptismum à nobis susceptum voluntate nostrâ committitur, illud omne contra Spiritum Sanctum affirmant gestum esse, et remitti non posse.—*Reformatio Leg. Eccles., de Hæres., cap. 9.*

(d) In these foresaid places, the Apostle toucheth specially three things, which must concur and go together in our justification. Upon God’s part, his great mercy and grace; upon Christ’s part, justice—that is, the satisfaction of God’s justice, or the price of our redemption, by the offering of his body, and shedding of his blood, with fulfilling of the law perfectly and thoroughly; and upon our part, true and lively faith in the merits of Jesus Christ, which yet is not ours, but by God’s working in us. So that in our justification is not only God’s mercy and grace, but also his justice, which the Apostle calleth the justice of God; and it consisteth in paying our ransom, and fulfilling of the law: and so the grace of God doth not exclude the justice of God in our justification, but only excludeth the justice of man—that is to say, the justice of our works, as to be merits of deserving our justification.—*Homily on Salvation, attributed to Cranmer.*

(e) I cannot help thinking, that some misconception and perversion of the Scripture doctrine of salvation may have arisen from an ambiguity in the words, "saved by faith without works," arising from the different meanings which may be annexed to them, accordingly as they are spoken or written. If we could have been saved by our own good works, Christ would have died in vain. But as we cannot be saved "by works," God has mercifully appointed that we shall be saved "by faith without works." But "to be saved by faith without works," that is, "per fidem, nullo Operum adjumento," has a very different meaning from being "saved by faith without works," that is, "per fidem infructuosam." In the first sense, "without works" is the attribute of the verb; in the second, it is the attribute of the noun. The difference is still more striking in Greek. We are saved *ἐὰν πιστεύω, ἀνεὺ ἐργων*, but not *ἐὰν πιστεύω τῆς ἀνεὺ ἐργων*. For we are saved by faith—without works; but not by *the* faith which is without works. The former sense, by admitting that we are saved not by works (for our best works are far short of our duty), but by an atonement of infinitely greater value, does not exclude the necessity of good works; but the latter supposes the validity of a faith unproductive of good works—a sense contrary to the whole tenor of Scripture.—*Bishop of Durham's Charge*, 1801.

(f) And for a further declaration how, and by what means, we be made partakers of this benefit of justification, it is to be noted, that this word justification, as it is taken in Scripture, signifieth the making of us righteous afore God, where before we were unrighteous; as when by his grace we convert unto him, and be reconciled into his favour; and of the children of ire and damnation we be made the children of God, and inheritors of everlasting life; that by his grace we may walk so in his ways, that finally we may be reputed and taken as just and righteous in the day of judgment.—*Necess. Erud. sign. e.*

(g) Nor when they (the Fathers) say, that we be justified freely, they mean not that we should or might afterward be idle, and that nothing should be required on our parts afterward; neither they mean not so to be justified, without our good works, that we should do no good works at all, like as shall be more expressed at large hereafter. But this saying, that we be justified by faith only, freely, and without works, is spoken for to take away clearly all merit of our works, as being insufficient to deserve our justification at God's hands, and thereby most plainly to express the weakness of man, and the goodness of God; the great infirmity of ourselves, and the might and power of God; the imperfectness of our own works, and the most abundant grace of our Saviour Christ; and, therefore, wholly to ascribe the merit and deserving of our justification unto Christ only, and his most precious blood-shedding.—*Homily on Salvation.*

(h) For that faith which bringeth forth (without repentance) either evil works, or no good works, is not a right, pure, and lively faith; but a dead, devilish, counterfeit, and feigned faith, as St. Paul and St. James call it.—*Homily on Salvation.*

CHAPTER III.

POPERY AND CATHOLICISM

SECTION 1. *Ridley's Piteous Lamentation.*

SECTION 2. *Ridley on Image Worship.*

SECTION 3. *Becon on Absolution.*

SECTION 4. *Bramhall on Baptismal Regeneration.*

PREFACE.

AMONG the subjects which engaged the attention of the Reformers, absolution, regeneration, and the sacraments, occupied necessarily a prominent position. Coming as they did out of the darkness of Popery into the light of a scriptural Christianity, and having the Bible *suddenly* put before them, not as a book to be studied in secret and treated like the tomes of the scholastic divinity, but as the ultimate authority of appeal, they were necessarily a little embarrassed by their new position: the mode in which this embarrassment displayed itself is generally overlooked—too generally, indeed, when we reflect on the effect which it had on the progress of the Reformation.

Defering from education to the Fathers, and from conviction to the Scriptures, they used *both*, for the most part, as independent authorities. They proved one proposition from St. Paul, and another proposition from St. Chrysostom, and reduced, too often, the contest between themselves and their opponents to one of individual ability. Yet, among the Anglican Reformers, there was one remarkable alike for his learning, his controversial power, and his unvarying Catholicity—one who read the Scriptures by the torch of ecclesiastical antiquity and the Fathers, as witnessing to scriptural truth: this great man was Nicholas Ridley. So well aware of his influence and merit were the Papalizing leaders of his time, that one of them said—“Latimer leaneth unto Cranmer, Cranmer leaneth unto Ridley, and Ridley leaneth unto his own singular wit.” We have but to examine their writings to find with how sound a judgment was this spoken; for Cranmer is always most correct when “leaning” to Ridley, and Latimer when “leaning” to Cranmer. That Catholicism remained when Popery was eliminated, must

be self-evident ; the danger was, lest, by too vehement a purification, more than Romanism might be lost.

He who wishes to distil spirit from a watery fluid must apply a *gentle* heat, or he will drive the water away along with it. The Reformers were not sparing in their vituperations of the Pope, and the mass, and the sale of indulgences, and the doctrine of transubstantiation ; but they never extended their objections to the apostolical succession, the efficacy of the sacraments, or the deference due to ecclesiastical antiquity. We must not be misled by the fervour of their occasional denunciations ; for, however energetic in *manner*, they are always scrupulously limited as to the *matter* of their objections.

Ridley argues against Popery with quite as much warmth as a modern Dissenter could do, and perhaps with much more sincerity ; but the spirit of rationalism and liberalism which would pervade the latter, might be sought in vain in the former.

The Reformation was a gradual work ; it begun with Wickliffe, or even earlier, it was completed in the reign of Elizabeth ; and there is no more common or yet grosser error than to imagine that our forefathers were one day Papists—dark, carnal, and bigoted ; and the next, by Act of Parliament, Catholics—enlightened, spiritual, and full of charity.

One by one the errors of Romanism were cast aside, and the pure truths of Catholicity brought into their proper position ; but the *first* objects of attack in the era of Henry VIII. were those points of the Roman discipline which pressed the most heavily upon royal convenience. First, the supremacy of the Pope was renounced ; then absolution was put on its true grounds ; then the authority of Fathers and Councils was justly defined. During the course of these discussions the nature of schism was ascertained, and a tacit admission given to the doctrine of the apostolical succession. *Afterwards* the sacraments became the objects of patient investigation ; the truth was elicited, as it were, piece by piece, till at length it stood clearly and beautifully developed in the revised Articles.

In like manner those grand and all-important truths, Justification by Faith, the Necessity of Personal Holiness, and Baptismal Regeneration, were wrought out—not hastily, nor in

a rationalistic spirit of self-reliance, but patiently, after much research and many prayers, and cautiously, as the public mind was able to bear them. And here we are well aware that we shall be met with the assertion, "the public mind is always able to bear the truth." We reply, not from *all lips* and under *all circumstances*. The prejudices of men require caution in overcoming them; and it was a fortunate thing for the Reformers of the Anglican Church that as their own prejudices were *gradually* overcome, so *they* acted *gradually* on those of others. It is a very remarkable fact, that the work of purification was continually progressive; there was nothing to be undone. The divines who headed the movement in the reign of Edward VI. did nothing (by the authority of the Church) that the leading divines of the Elizabethan era had to disown. Where they were secure, none could be bolder than they were; where difficulties arose, none more cautious. An instance, not unworthy of notice, may be given in their systematic rejection of the term "Protestant," in authoritative documents. It does not once occur in the Common Prayer; they used the term Catholic. Protestantism implied an ascendancy in the thing protested against. They looked forward, not merely to the abolition of that ascendancy, but to the annihilation of the very corruption itself. They well knew that the Church Catholic is of herself a continual protest against all heresy; and while they used the term Protestant freely in the controversies of the day, they avoided it in those services of the Reformed, yet Catholic, Anglican Church, which they hoped to bequeath to a more tranquil era. Now there is very strong presumption that this Catholic spirit, this almost prophetic far-sightedness, this cautious wisdom, which thus marked the onward movement of the Anglican Reformation, is a debt which, under God, the Church chiefly owes to Nicholas Ridley, bishop and martyr; and we have therefore determined not to let this series of Tracts be without some specimen of his writings.

The selection was attended with peculiar difficulties; for though the controversies which were carried on in those days are being carried on in our own, and the very same questions which were once discussed by Cranmer and Ridley and Bradford

and Latimer, against Gardiner and Pole and Harpsferd and Chedsey, are now agitated by Faber and Whittaker and Newman, against Wiseman and many others; yet we do not desire to reprint *controversy*. Ridley's works are all either practical or controversial; and though we have reason to believe that he was the author of some purely doctrinal Tracts, they are not now extant. Under these circumstances we have selected the first part of his "Piteous Lamentation:" it gives a statement of the differences between the nation before the dawn of the Reformation was overcast, and under the unhappy reign of Mary: it may be considered as partly doctrinal and partly historical, and in both lights the known moderation of its author gives it a high value. Similar reasons induce us to reprint his treatise on Image Worship. We next take a Tract of Thomas Becon, an active and learned man, one of the most prominent among the Reformers, the chaplain and intimate friend of Cranmer, and who is supposed to have had a hand in drawing up the offices of the Church: it is entitled "The Castle of Comfort," and treats of the nature and effects of absolution. If it be at all lawful to compare the writings of uninspired men with those of men moved by the Spirit to speak to the Church the words of God, we would say that as there is an apparent discrepancy, but a real agreement, between the Epistles of St. Paul and St. James, so is there between the opinions of Becon and those of Andrews. The sermon of the latter, upon absolution, was published in the second part of the first volume: it treats of the Church as having authority, and of her absolution as being no mere form, but a positive and unconditional forgiveness; and so doubtless it is, but not of the guilt of sin. The Church forgives offences against herself; she never presumed to forgive those committed against God. On this subject we shall enlarge in the notes, and pass on here with the remarks that Becon speaks of the guilt of sin and the forgiveness of God, while Andrews spoke of the offence against the Church and *her* forgiveness. Now, doubtless, though these were kept carefully distinct in the early Church, yet a corrupt priesthood was not slow to discern the use that might be made of a confusion. Gradually did the error prevail, that the priest had the power of forgiving sin, *as*

sin, and that his forgiveness involved that of God; and though this monstrous blasphemy was at no time formally acknowledged by the Roman Church, yet, by tacitly suffering her priesthood to inculcate the doctrine, she becomes justly chargeable with its effects. And here we find a signal instance of retributive justice: this error went on widening its course till it gave rise to the open sale of indulgences, and the sale of indulgences was the immediate cause of the Lutheran Reformation.

The third Tract in the present part is by Archbishop Bramhall, and speaks of baptismal regeneration, and the nature of the sacrament of baptism itself. And here, too, while we purpose to enlarge considerably in the notes, we cannot lose the opportunity of remarking the moderation of the Anglican Church. "The uncovenanted mercies of God" is a term much used by various controversialists of this day, and there is not a term more entirely unreasonable than this, as it is usually employed. When the wicked man enjoys prosperity he is enjoying an uncovenanted mercy; when a nation neglect God, and yet continue successful, it enjoys an uncovenanted mercy; when a child dies unbaptized, doubtless it is saved—and here, too, we may perhaps say that the child enjoys an uncovenanted mercy; but this is the utmost limit to which we have any authority to go: and, in other cases, *God bestows no mercies save those which he has covenanted to bestow*. The schismatic has *none* of the mercies promised to the Church, nor the heretic of those promised to the faithful: if either are saved, "so as by fire," as St. Paul observes, it is by the covenanted mercy promised in the words "He that cometh unto me I will in no wise cast out."

C.

CAMBRIDGE,
The Feast of St. David.

NOTE.

ON THE USE OF THE TERM "PROTESTANT."—It would be useless to enter into any disquisition of a historical character as to the use and propriety of this term among the Reformers on the continent. Where Popery maintained her ascendancy, there

those who advocated a purer faith and a more apostolic ritual were, of course, and continued to be, *Protestants*. Let it be supposed that a certain measure was introduced into Parliament, and carried, in spite of the *protest* of individual members : so long as the law in question was in operation, so long the title Protestant would justly apply to the individuals who entered their protest ; but if, in a subsequent session, the offensive enactment was repealed, then the *protest* would of itself fall to the ground—its object would be obtained, and those who entered it no longer *Protestants*. We would not quarrel with those who choose the title, albeit it is in England only applicable to Dissenters (*Romanists among the rest*) who *protest against* the *Established* Church. But we wish to put the phrase in its true light.

A PITEOUS LAMENTATION OF THE STATE OF ENGLAND.

BY NICHOLAS RIDLEY, D.D.,

BISHOP AND MARTYR.

ALAS ! what misery is thy Church brought unto, O Lord, at this day. Where of late the word of the Lord was truly preached, was read and heard in every town, in every church, in every village ; yea, and almost every honest man's house ; alas ! now it is exiled, and banished out of the whole realm. Of late who was not glad to be taken for a lover of God's word, for a reader, for a ready hearer, and for a learner of the same ? And now, alas ! who dare bear any open countenance towards it, but such as are content in Christ's cause, and for his word's sake, to stand to the danger and loss of all that they have ?

Of late there was to be found, of every age, of every degree and kind of people, that gave their diligence to learn, as they could, out of God's word, the articles of the Christian faith, the commandments of God, and the Lord's Prayer. The babes and young children were taught these things of their parents, of their masters, and weekly of their curates in every church ; and the aged folk, which had been brought up in blindness, and in ignorance of those things which every Christian is bound to know, when otherwise they could not, yet they learned the same, by often hearing their children and servants repeating the same ; but now, alas, and alas again ! the false prophets of antichrist, which are past all shame, do openly preach in pulpits, unto the people of God, that the catechism is to be counted heresy : whereby their old blindness is brought home again ; for the aged are afraid of the higher powers, and the youth is abashed and ashamed even of that which they have learned, though it be God's word, and dare no more meddle.

Of late, in every congregation throughout all England, was made prayer and petition unto God to be delivered from the tyranny of the Bishop of Rome and all his detestable enormities ; from all false doctrine and heresy : and now, alas ! Satan hath

persuaded England, by his falsehood and craft, to revoke her old godly prayer, to recant the same, and provoke the fearful wrath and indignation of God upon her own pate.

Of late, by strait laws and ordinances, with the consent of the nobles and commonalty, and full agreement and council of the prelates and clergy, was banished hence the beast of Babylon, with laws, I say, and with oaths, and all means that then could be devised for so godly a purpose: but now, alas! all these laws are trodden under foot: the nobles, the commonalty, the prelates, and clergy are quite changed; and all oaths, though they were herein made in judgment, justice, and truth, and the matter never so good, doth no more hold than a bond of rushes, or of a barley straw; nor public perjury no more feareth them than a shadow upon the wall, (Jer. iv.)

Of late it was agreed in England, of all hands, according to Paul's doctrine and Christ's commandment (as Paul saith plainly), that nothing ought to be done in the Church, in the public congregation, but in that tongue which the congregation could understand, that all might be edified thereby, whether it were common prayer, administration of the sacraments, or any other thing belonging to the public ministry of God's holy and wholesome word (1 Cor. xiv.): but, alas! all is turned upside down, Paul's doctrine is put apart, Christ's commandment is not regarded: for nothing is heard commonly in the Church, but in a strange tongue that the people doth nothing understand.

Of late all men and women were taught, after Christ's doctrine, to pray in that tongue which they could understand, that they might pray with their heart that which they should speak with their tongue: now, alas! the unlearned people are brought into that blindness again, to think that they pray when they speak with their tongues they cannot tell what, nor whereof their heart is nothing mindful at all, for that it can understand never a whit thereof.

Of late the Lord's Supper was duly ministered, and taught to be made common, to all that were true Christians, with thanksgiving, and setting forth of the Lord's death and passion, until his returning again to judge both quick and dead: but now, alas! the Lord's table is quite overthrown; and that which ought to be common to all godly, is made private to a few ungodly, without any kind of thanksgiving, or any setting forth of the Lord's death at all, that the people are able to understand.

Of late all that were endued with the light and grace of understanding of God's holy mysteries did bless God, which had brought them out of that horrible blindness and ignorance, whereby in times past, being seduced by Satan's subtilties, they believed

that the sacrament was not the sacrament, but the thing itself whereof it is a sacrament; that the creature was the Creator; and that the thing that hath neither life nor sense (alas! such was the horrible blindness), was the Lord himself, which made the eye to see, and hath given all senses and understanding unto man. But now, alas! England is returned again, like a dog, to her own vomit and spewing, and is in a worse case than ever she was: for it had been better never to have known the truth, than to forsake the truth once received and known: and now, not only that light is turned into darkness, and God's grace is received in vain, but also laws of death are made by High Court of Parliament, masterfully to maintain by sword, fire, and all kind of violence, that heinous idolatry, wherein that adoration is given unto the lifeless and dumb creature which is only due unto the ever-living God; yea, they say they can and do make of bread both man and God, by their transubstantiation. O! wicked invention, and Satan's own brood!

Of late was the Lord's cup at his table distributed, according to his own commandment, by his express words in his Gospel, as well to the laity as to the clergy, which order Christ's Church observed so many hundred years after, as all the ancient ecclesiastical writers do testify, without contradiction of any one of them, that can be shown, unto this day: but now, alas! not only the Lord's commandment is broken, his cup is denied to his servants, to whom he commanded it should be distributed, but also with the same is set up a new blasphemous kind of sacrifice, to satisfy and pay the price of sins, both of the dead and of the quick, to the great and intolerable contumely of Christ our Saviour, his death and passion, which was and is the one only sufficient and everlasting available sacrifice, satisfactory for all the elect of God, from Adam the first to the last that shall be born in the end of the world.

Of late that commandment of God, "Thou shalt not make to thyself any graven image, nor any similitude or likeness of anything in heaven above, or in earth beneath, or in the water under the earth; thou shalt not bow down to them nor worship them:" this commandment of God, I say, was graven almost everywhere in churches, was learned of everybody, both young and old; whereupon images that provoked the simple and ignorant people unto idolatry, as the wise man saith, were taken out of the churches, and straitly forbidden that none should anywhere either bow down to them or worship them: but now, alas! God's holy word is blotted, and razed out of churches, and stocks and stones are set up in the place thereof. God commandeth his word so to be ordered that it might be had in

continual remembrance at all times, and in every place; and, on the other side, he forbade images and idols so to be either made or set in any place where any should bow or worship them: but now, alas! that which God commanded is not passed upon, and that which he forbiddeth is masterfully maintained by falsehood and craft, and wickedly upholden.

Of late all ministers that were admitted to the public office and ministry of God's holy word, in their admission made a solemn profession, before the congregation, that they should teach the people nothing, as doctrine necessary to attain eternal salvation, but that which is God's own holy word, or may be thereof grounded without any doubt, whereby vanished and melted away of themselves many vain, yea, wicked traditions of man, as wax before the fire: but now at one brunt they are revived, and are in full hope all to return again, in as great strength as ever they have been. And how can any man look for any other thing, but when you have received the head you must also receive the whole body withal, or else how can the head abide? The head, under Satan, of all mischief, is antichrist, and his brood; and the same is he which is the Babylonical beast. The beast is he whereupon the whore sitteth. The whore is that city, saith John in plain words, which hath empire over the kings of the earth. This whore hath a golden cup of abominations in her hand, whereof she maketh to drink the kings of the earth; and of the wine of this harlot all nations hath drunk: yea, and kings of the earth have lain by this whore, and merchants of the earth, by virtue of her pleasant merchandise, have been made rich.

Now what city is there in the whole world that, when John wrote, ruled over the kings of the earth; or what city can be read of in any time that, of the city itself, challenged the empire over the kings of the earth, but only the city of Rome, and that since the usurpation of that see hath grown to her full strength? And is it not read that old and ancient writers understood Peter's former epistle to be written at Rome, and it to be called of him in the same epistle, in plain terms, Babylon? By the abominations thereof, I understand all the whole trade of the Romish religion, under the name and title of Christ, which is contrary to the only rule of all true religion—that is, God's word. What word of God hath that harlot for the maintenance of her manifold abominations, and to set to sell such merchandise, wherewith (alas! the madness of man) the wicked harlot hath bewitched almost the whole world? Did not Peter, the true apostle of Christ (of whom she beareth herself so high, but falsely, and without all just cause)—did not

he I say, give all the world warning of her pelf and trash, of her false doctors and apostles (for this whore and beast will be called *Dominus Apostolicus*, whosoever say nay), after this manner, in his latter epistle? “There were among the people in times past false prophets, as there shall be also among you, in time to come, false teachers, which shall privily bring in pestilent sects, even denying the Lord which hath bought them and redeemed them, procuring to themselves swift damnation: and many shall follow their damnable ways, by whom the way of truth shall be railed upon, and through covetousness, by counterfeit tales or sermons, they shall (saith Peter) make merchandise upon you,” &c. (2 Pet. ii.). And doth not John likewise, in his Revelation, after he hath reckoned up a great rabblement of this whore’s mystical merchandise, at the last (as though he would knit up all in plain words, without any mist at all, setting out the whore’s merchandise) reckon up among the rest, and concludeth saying, *et animas hominum*—“and the souls of men, too?” Whereupon, I pray you, else rose this true proverb, *Omnia Romæ venalia*—“All things for money are set to sale at Rome?” Was not that a worthy commendation of Christ’s vicar in earth, that was written of our holy father, one of the Alexanders, a bishop of Rome, thus I ween in Latin:—

“Vendit Alexander cruces, altaria, Christum,
Vendere jure potest, emerat ille prius.”

Which I have seen of one thus translated:—

Alexander, our holy father, the Pope of Rome,
Selleth for money both right and doom:
And all kind of holiness the holy father doth not stick
To set to sale, ready money for to get.
And eke Christ himself he dare be bold,
To chop and change for silver and gold:
And why should any think this to be sore,
For what doth he sell but that he bought before?

I grant these verses to be light gear, and the verse is but rude; but, alas! such conditions were more wicked and lewd than any wit could express. If these had been but the faults of one or a few in number, they had been less pernicious, and might have been taken for personal crimes, not to be imputed unto that see: but now, alas! the matter is more than evident, to all that hath godly understanding, that these crimes be grounded upon laws, be established by custom, and set forth by all kinds of wicked doctrine, falsehood, and craft; and therefore are not now to be esteemed for any one man’s, or a few men’s, personal crimes, but are now, by laws, custom, and doctrine, incorporated into that wicked see, and maketh, indeed, the body of the beast, whereupon the abominable whore doth sit.

But you would know which be those merchandise which I said this whore setteth forth to sell, for the which all her false prophets, with all their jugglings and crafty gloses, cannot bring one jot of God's word. Surely, surely, they be not only all these abominations which are come into the Church of England already (whereof I have spoken somewhat before), but also an innumerable rabblement of abominations and wicked abuses, which now must needs follow: as Popish pardons, pilgrimages, Romish purgatory, Romish masses, *placebo et dirige*, with trentals, and *scala cæli*, dispensations, and immunities, from all godly discipline, laws, and good order, pluralities, unions, *tot quottes*, with a thousand more.

Now shall come in the flattering friars and the false pardoners, and play their old pranks and knavery, as they were wont to do. Now you shall have (but of the see of Rome only, and that for money) canonizing of such saints as have stood stout in the Pope's cause, shrining of relics, and from any kind of wickedness (if you will pay well for it), clear absolution, *a pænâ et culpa*, with thousands of years; yea, at every poor bishop's hands and suffragan ye shall have hallowing of churches, chapels, altars, superaltars, chalices, and of all the whole household stuff and adornment, which shall be used in the Church after the Romish guise; for all these things must be esteemed of such high price, that they may not be done but by a consecrated bishop only. O Lord, all these things are such as thy apostles never knew. As for conjuring (they call it hallowing, but it is conjuring indeed) of water and salt, of christening of bells, and such like light things, what need I to speak? For every priest that can but read hath power, they say, not only to do that, but also such power over Christ's body as to make God and man, once at the least every day, of a wafer-cake.

After the rehearsal of the said abominations, and remembrance of a number of many more, which, the Lord knoweth, irketh me to think upon, and were too long to describe: when I consider, on the other side, the eternal word of God that abideth for ever, and the undefiled law of the Lord, which turneth the soul from all wickedness, and giveth wisdom unto the innocent babes: I mean that milk that is without guile, as Peter doth call it, that good word of God, that word of truth which must be graven within the heart, and then is able to save men's souls; that wholesome seed, not mortal, but immortal, of the eternal and ever-living God, whereby the man is born anew, and made the child of God; that seed of God, whereby the man of God, so being born, cannot sin, as John saith (he meaneth so long as that seed doth abide in him), that holy Scripture which hath not been devised by the wit of man, but taught

from heaven by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, which is profitable to teach, to reprove, to correct, to instruct, and give order in all righteousness, that the man of God may be whole and sound, ready to perform every good work : when, I say, I consider this holy and wholesome true word, that teacheth us truly our bounden duty towards our Lord God in every point, what his blessed will and pleasure is, what his infinite great goodness and mercy is, what he hath done for us, how he hath given his own only dear beloved to death for our salvation, and by him hath sent us the revelation of his blessed will and pleasure ; what his eternal word willetli us both to believe and also to do, and hath for the same purpose inspired the holy apostles with the Holy Ghost, and sent them abroad into all the world, and also made them, and other disciples of Christ, inspired by the same Spirit, to write, and leave behind them the same things that they taught, which as they did proceed of the Spirit of truth, so, by the confession of all them that ever were endued with the Spirit of God, were sufficient to the obtaining of eternal salvation : and likewise when I consider that all that man doth profess in his regeneration when he is received into the holy Catholic Church of Christ, and is now to be accounted for one of the lively members of Christ's own body, all that is grounded upon God's holy word, and standeth in the profession of that faith and obedience of those commandments which are all contained and comprised in God's holy word : and furthermore, when I consider whom our Saviour Christ pronounceth in his Gospel to be blessed, and to whom Moses giveth his benedictions in the law ; what ways the law, the prophets, the psalms, and all holy Scriptures, both new and old, do declare to be the ways of the Lord ; what is good for man to obtain and abide in God's favour ; which is that faith which justifieth before God ; and what is that charity that doth pass and excel all ; which be the properties of heavenly wisdom ; and which is that undefiled religion that is allowed of God ; which things Christ himself calleth the weighty matters of the law ; what thing is that which is only available in Christ ; and what knowledge is that that Paul esteemed so much that he counted himself only to know ; what shall be the manner of the extreme judgment of the latter day : who shall judge, and by what he shall judge ; and what shall be required at our hands at that fearful day : how all things must be tried by the fire ; and that that only shall stand for ever which Christ's word shall allow : which shall be the judge of all flesh, to give sentence upon all flesh, and every living soul, either of eternal damnation or everlasting salvation, from which sentence there shall be no place of appeal, no wit shall

serve to delude, nor any power to withstand or revoke: when, I say, I consider all these things, and confer to the same, again and again, all those ways wherein standeth the substance of the Romish religion (whereof I spake before), it may be evident and easy to perceive that these two ways, these two religions—the one of Christ, the other of the Romish see—in these latter days, be as far distinct the one from the other as light and darkness; good and evil; righteousness and unrighteousness; Christ and Belial. He that is hard of belief let him note and weigh well with himself the places of holy Scripture which be appointed in the margin whereupon this talk is grounded, and by God's grace he may receive some light. And unto the contemner I have nothing now to say, but to rehearse the saying of the prophet Isaiah, which Paul spake to the Jews in the end of the Acts of the Apostles. After he had expounded unto them the truth of God's word, and declared unto them Christ out of the law of Moses and the prophets, from morning to night, all the day long, he said unto them that would not believe: "Well (said he) spake the Holy Ghost unto our fathers, saying: Go unto this people and tell them—ye shall hear with your ears, and not understand; and seeing, you shall behold, and not see the thing; for the heart of this people is waxed gross or dull, and with their ears they are hard of hearing, and they have shut together their eyes that they should not see, nor hear with their ears, nor understand with their hearts, that they might return and I should heal them, saith the Lord God."

Alas! England, alas! that this heavy plague of God should fall upon thee. Alas! my dear beloved country, what thing is it now that may do thee good? Undoubtedly thy plague is so great that it is utterly incurable, but by the bottomless mercy and infinite power of Almighty God. Alas! my dear country, what hast thou done that thus thou hast provoked the wrath of God, to pour out his vengeance upon thee for thine own deserts? Canst thou be content to hear thy faults told thee? Alas! thou hast heard oft, and wouldst never amend. England, thy faults, of all degrees and sorts of men—of the magistrates, of the ministers, and of the common people—were never more plainly told, since thou barest that name, than thou didst hear them of late, even before the magistrates in King Edward's days, but thou heardst them only, and didst amend never a whit. For even of thy greatest magistrates, some (the king's highness, then, that innocent, that godly-hearted and peerless young Christian prince excepted) evermore unkindly and ungently, against those that went about most busily and most wholesomely to cure their sore backs, spurning privily,

and would not spare to speak evil of them, even unto the prince himself, and yet would they towards the same preachers outwardly bear a jolly countenance and a fair face.

I have heard that Cranmer, and another* whom I will not name, were both in high displeasure, the one for showing his conscience secretly, but plainly and fully, in the Duke of Somerset's cause, and both of late, but especially Cranmer, for repugning as they might against the late spoil of the Church goods, taken away only by commandment of the higher powers, without any law or order of justice, and without any request of consent of them to whom they did belong. As for Latimer, Lever, Bradford, and Knox, their tongues were so sharp, they ripped in so deep in their galled backs, to have purged them, no doubt, of that filthy matter that was festered in their hearts, of insatiable covetousness, of filthy carnality and voluptuousness, of intolerable ambition and pride, of ungodly loathsomeness to hear poor men's causes, and to hear God's word, that these men, of all other, these magistrates then could never abide. Other there were, very godly men, and well learned, that went about with the wholesome plasters of God's word, howbeit after a more soft manner of handling the matter; but, alas! all sped in like. For all that could be done of all hands their disease did not minish, but daily did increase, which, no doubt, is no small occasion, in that state, of the heavy plague of God that is poured upon England at this day. As for the common sort of other inferior magistrates, as judges of the laws, justices of the peace, serjeants, common lawyers, it may be truly said of them, as of the most part of the clergy, of curates, vicars, parsons, prebendaries, doctors of the law, archdeacons, deans; yea, and I may say of bishops also, I fear me, for the most part, although I doubt not but God had, and hath ever, whom he in every state knew, and knoweth to be his; but for the most part, I say, they were never persuaded in their hearts, but from the teeth forward, and for the king's sake, in the truth of God's word; and yet all these did dissemble, and bear a copy of a countenance as if they had been sound within.

And this dissimulation Satan knew well enough, and therefore desired, and hath ever gone about, that the high magistrates, by any manner of means, might be deceived in matters of religion; for then he, being of counsel with the dissimulation in the worldly, knew well enough that he should bring to pass, and rule all even after his own will.

Hypocrisy and dissimulation Saint Jerome doth call well a double wickedness, for neither it loveth the truth (which is one

* Himself.

great evil), and also falsely it pretendeth to deceive the simple for another thing. This hypocrisy and dissimulation with God in matters of religion, no doubt, hath wholly also provoked the anger of God. And as for the common people, although there were many good, where they were well and diligently taught, yet, God knoweth, a great number received God's true word and high benefits with unthankful hearts. For it was a great pity, and a lamentable thing, to have seen in many places the people so loathsomely and so unreligiously to come to the holy communion, and to receive it accordingly, and to the common prayers, and other divine service which were according to the true vein of God's holy word, in all points so godly and wholesomely set forth, in comparison of that blind zeal and indiscreet devotion which they had aforesaid to those things whereof they understood never one whit, nor could be edified by them any thing at all.

And again, as for alms deeds, which are taught in God's word, whereby we are certain that God is pleased with them, and doth and will require such at our hands, which are a part of true religion, as St. James saith, and such as He saith himself he setteth more by than by sacrifice, as to provide for the fatherless, infants and orphans, for the lame, aged, and impotent poor needy folk, and to make public provision that the poverty that might labour should have wherewith to labour upon, and so be kept from shameful beggary and stealing—in these works, I say, how wayward were many, in comparison, I mean, of that great prodigality whereby in times past they spared not to spend upon flattering friars, false pardoners, painting and gilding of stocks and stones to be set up and honoured in churches; plainly against God's word. And yet because no place is to be defrauded of their just commendation, London, I must confess, that such godly works, in Sir Richard Dobs, knight, then lord mayor his year, began marvellous well: the Lord grant the same may so likewise persevere, continue, yea, and increase to the comfort and relief of the needy and helpless that was so godly begun. Amen.

All these things do minister matter of more mourning and bewailing the miserable state that now is; for by this it may be perceived how England hath deserved this just plague of God. And also it is greatly to be feared that those good things, whatsoever they were, that had their beginning in the time when God's word was freely preached, now, with the exile and banishment of the same, they will depart again.

A TREATISE OF
DR. NICHOLAS RIDLEY,
IN THE NAME, AS IT SEEMETH, OF THE WHOLE CLERGY,
ADDRESSED TO KING EDWARD VI., CONCERNING IMAGES, THAT THEY
ARE NOT TO BE SET UP, NOR WORSHIPPED IN CHURCHES.

FIRST PART.

Certain reasons which move us that we cannot with safe consciences give our assents that the Images of Christ, &c., should be placed and erected in Churches.

FIRST, the words of the commandment, “Thou shalt not make to thyself any graven image,” &c. (Exod. xx.) And the same is repeated more plainly (Deut. xxvii.), “Cursed is the man which maketh a graven or molten image, &c., and setteth it in a secret place, and all the people shall say, amen.”

In the first place, these words are to be noted: “Thou shalt not make to thyself;” that is, to any use of religion.

In the latter place, these words: “And setteth it in a secret place;” for no man then durst commit idolatry openly. So that, comparing the places, it evidently appears, that images, both for use of religion and in place of peril * for idolatry, are forbidden.

God, knowing the inclination of man to idolatry, sheweth the reason why he made this general prohibition: “Lest, peradventure, thou, being deceived, shouldst bow down to them and worship them.”

This general law is generally † to be observed, notwithstanding that peradventure a great number cannot be hurt by them, which may appear by the example following.

God forbade the people to join their children in marriage with strangers, adding the reason: “For they will seduce thy son, that he shall not follow me.” (Deut. vii.)

* Placed where there is danger of their being worshipped.

† By all.

Moses* was not deceived or seduced by Jethro's daughter, nor Boaz by Ruth, being a woman of Moab. And yet for all that, the general law was to be observed, "Thou shalt join no marriage with them." And so likewise, "Thou shalt not make to thyself any graven image," &c.

In Deuteronomy, God gives a special charge to avoid images : "Beware that thou forget not the covenant of the Lord thy God which he made with thee, and so make to thyself any graven image of anything which the Lord hath forbidden thee; for the Lord thy God is a consuming fire, and a jealous God. If thou have children and nephews, and do dwell in the land, and, being deceived, make to yourselves any graven image, doing evil before the Lord your God, and provoke him to anger, I do this day call heaven and earth to witness that you shall quickly perish out of the land which you shall possess; you shall not dwell in it any longer, but the Lord will destroy you and scatter you amongst all nations."

Note what a solemn obtestation God useth, and what grievous punishments he threateneth to the breakers of the second commandment.

In the tabernacle and temple of God no image was by God appointed to be set openly, nor by practice afterwards used or permitted, so long as religion was purely observed; so that the use and execution of the law is a good interpreter of the true meaning of the same.

If, by virtue of the second commandment, images were not lawful in the temple of the Jews, then by the same commandment they are not lawful in the churches of the Christians. For being a moral commandment, and not ceremonial (for, by consent of writers, only a part of the precept of observing the Sabbath is ceremonial), it is a perpetual commandment, and bindeth us as well as the Jews.

The Jews by no means would consent to Herod, Pilate, or Petronius, that images should be placed in the temple of Jerusalem; but rather offered themselves to death than assent unto it: who, besides that they are commended by Josephus for observing the meaning of the law, would not have endangered themselves so far, if they had thought images had been indifferent in the temple of God. For as St. Paul saith (2 Cor. vi.): "What hath the temple of God to do with idols?" (Joseph. Antiq., lib. xvii., cap. 8; lib. xviii., cap. 5 and 15).

* It should be remembered that Moses acted previous to the promulgation of the law in question, and Boaz in obedience to a peculiar and in his case superior one. [Ed.]

God's Scripture in no place commends the use of images, but in a great number of places doth disallow and condemn them.

They are called, in the book of Wisdom, the trap and snare of the feet of the ignorant.

It is said the invention of them was the beginning of spiritual fornication: and that they were not from the beginning, neither shall they continue to the end.

In the fifteenth chapter of the same book it is said, "Their pictures are a worthless labour." And again, "They are worthy of death that put their trust in them, that make them, that love them, and that worship them."

The Psalms and prophets are full of like sentences; and how can we then praise that which God's Spirit doth always dispraise?

Furthermore, an image made by a father, as appears in the same book, * for the memorial of his son departed, was the first invention of images, and occasion of idolatry.

How much more, then, shall an image made in the memory of Christ, and set up in the place of religion, occasion the same offence? (Euseb. Eccles. Histor., lib. vii., cap. 18). Images have their beginning from the heathen; and upon no good ground, therefore, can they be profitable to Christians. Whereunto Athanasius agrees, when writing of images against the Gentiles:† "The invention of images came of no good, but of evil; and whatsoever hath an evil beginning can never in anything be judged good, seeing it is wholly naught."

St. John says, "My little children, beware of images;" but to set them in the churches, which are places dedicated to the service and invocation of God, and that over the Lord's table, being the highest and most honourable place, where most danger of abuse both is and ever hath been, is not to beware of them nor to flee from them, but rather to embrace and receive them. Tertullian, expounding the same words, writeth thus. (Lib. de Corona Militis): "Little children, keep yourselves from the shape itself, or form of them."

Images in the Church either serve to edify or to destroy. If they edify, then is there a kind of edification which the Scriptures neither teach nor command, but always disallow: if

* "Thus some parent mourning bitterly for a son who hath been taken from him, makes an image of his child; and him who before had been to his family as a dead man they now begin to worship as a god; rites and scriptures being instituted to be observed by his dependents."—*Book of Wisdom*, xiv.

† Athanasius, cont gentes, ἡ τῶν ἐιδώλων ἐκρίσις οὐκ ἀπὸ ἀγαθῶ, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ κακίας γίγνεται, τὸ ἐκ τῆς ἀρχῆς ἔχων κακίην ἐν οὕτῳ ποτε καλὸν κριθείη, οὐδὲν ὄν φάσκειν.

they destroy, they are not to be used ; for in the Church of God all things ought to be done to edify. (1 Cor. xiv.)

The commandment of God is, "Thou shalt not lay a stumbling-block or a stone before the blind ;" and "Cursed is he that maketh the blind to wander in his way."

The simple and unlearned people who have been so long under blind guides, are blind in matters of religion, and inclined to error and idolatry. Therefore, to set images before them to stumble at (for they are snares and traps for the feet of the ignorant), or to lead them out of the true way, is not only against the commandment of God, but deserveth also the malediction and curse of God.

The use of images is, to the learned and confirmed in knowledge, neither necessary nor profitable. To the superstitious, it is a confirmation in error. To the simple and weak, an occasion to fall, and very offensive and wounding to their consciences ; and, therefore, very dangerous. For St. Paul saith (1 Cor. ix.) : "Offending the brethren and wounding their weak consciences, they sin against Christ." And Matt. xviii. : "Woe be to him by whom offence or occasion of falling cometh ; it were better that a millstone were tied about his neck and be cast into the sea, than to offend one of the little ones that believe in Christ." And where an objection may be made that such offence may be taken away by sincere doctrine and preaching, it is to be answered, that is not sufficient ; as hereafter more at large shall appear.

And though it should be admitted as true, yet it should follow that sincere doctrine and preaching should always, and in all places, continue as well as images : and so that where-soever an image were erected to offend, there should also, of reason, a godly and sincere preacher be continually maintained ; for it is reason that the remedy be as large as the offence, the medicine as general as the poison ; but that is not possible in the realm of England, if images should be generally allowed, as reason and experience may teach.

As good magistrates, who intend to banish all whoredom, do drive away all naughty persons, especially out of such places as be suspected ; even so, images, being "*Meretrices*," *id est*, "*Whores*"—for that the worshipping of them is called in the prophets fornication and adultery—ought to be banished, and especially out of churches, which is the most suspected place, and where the spiritual fornication hath been most committed.

It is not expedient to allow and admit that which is hurtful to the greatest number ; but in all churches and commonwealths the ignorant and weak are the greatest number, to whom images are hurtful, and not profitable.

And whereas it is commonly alleged that images in churches stir up the mind to devotion, it may be answered that, contrariwise, they rather distract the mind from prayer, hearing of God's word, and other godly meditations; as we read that, in the council chamber of the Lacedemonians, no picture or image was suffered, lest, in consultation of weighty matters of the common weal, their minds, by the sight of the outward image, might be occasioned to withdraw or to wander from the matter.

The experience of this present time declareth that those parts of the realm which think, and are persuaded, that God is not offended by doing outward reverence to an image, most desire the restitution of images, and have been most diligent to set them up again: restitution, therefore, of them, by common authority, shall confirm them more in their error, to the danger of their souls, than ever they were before. For, as one man writeth, "Nothing is more certain or sure than that which of doubtful is made certain."*

The profit of images is uncertain; the peril, by experience of all ages and states of the Church, as afore, is most certain.

The benefit to be obtained by them, if there be any, is very small; the danger in seeing of them, which is the danger of idolatry, is the greatest of all other. Now, to allow a most certain peril for an uncertain profit, and the greatest danger for the smallest benefit, in matters of faith and religion, is a tempting of God, and a grievous offence.

SECOND PART.

Probations out of the Fathers, Councils, and Histories.

First, it is manifest that, in the primitive Church, images were not commonly used in churches, oratories, and places of assembly for religion; but they were generally detested and abhorred, insomuch that the want of imagery was objected to the Christians, by the heathen, as a crime.

Origen relates that Celsus objected the lack of images, (lib. iv., contra Celsum).

Arnobius saith also, that the ethnics accused the Christians, that they had neither altars nor images.

Zephirus, in his "Commentary upon the Apology of Tertullian," gathers thus of Tertullian's words: "That place of persuasion were very cold, and to no purpose at all, except we hold this always, that Christians in those days did hate, most of all, images, with their trim decking and ornaments."

Irenaeus (lib. i., cap. 24) reproves the heretics called Gnostics, because that they carried about the image of Christ, made in

* Nihil magis est certum quam quod ex dubio factum est certum.

Pilate's time, after his own proportion * (which were much more to be esteemed than any that can be made now); using also, for declaration of their affection towards it, to set garlands upon the head of it.

Lactantius affirms plainly (lib. *Divin. Instit.* ii., cap. 19): "It is not to be doubted that there is no religion wherever there is any image." If Christians, then, had used images, he would not have made his proposition so large.

St. Augustine (*De Civitate Dei*, lib. iv., cap. 31) commends Varro the Roman in these words: "Since Varro thought religion might be kept more purely without images, who does not see how near he came to the truth?" So that, not only by Varro's judgment, but also by St. Augustine's approbation, the most pure and chaste observation of religion, and the nearest the truth, is to be without images.

The same St. Augustine, in *Ps. cxiii.*, hath these words: "Images have more force to bow down and crook the silly soul, than to teach it."

And upon the same Psalm he moves this question: "Every child, yea, every beast knoweth that it is not God which they see; why, then, doth the Holy Ghost so oft give warning to beware of that which all do know?" St. Augustine answers: "When they are set in churches, and begin once to be worshipped of the multitude or common people, straightway springs up a most filthy affection of error."

This place of St. Augustine well opens how weak a reason it is to say, images are a thing indifferent in chambers and in churches; for the alteration of the place, manner, and other circumstances, oftentimes alters the nature of the thing. It is lawful to buy and sell in the market, but not so in churches. It is lawful to eat and drink, but not so in churches. And therefore saith St. Paul: "Have you not houses to eat and drink in? Do you condemn the Church of God?"

Many other actions there be which are lawful and honest in private places, which are neither comely nor honest, not only in churches, but also in other assemblies of honest people.

Tertullian saith he used sometimes to burn frankincense in his chamber, which was then used by idolators, and is so still in the Romish churches; but he joineth withal: "But not after such a rite or ceremony, nor after such a fashion, nor with such preparation or sumptuousness, as it is done before the idols."

So that images placed in churches, and set in an honourable place of estimation, as St. Augustine saith, and especially over

* Made like to the actual bodily form and proportion in which Christ appeared upon earth.

the Lord's table, which is done (using the words of Tertullian) after the same manner and fashion which the Papists used, especially after so long continuance of abuse of images, and so many being blinded with superstitious opinion towards them—cannot be counted a thing indifferent, but a most certain ruin of many souls.

Epiphanius, in his epistle to John Bishop of Jerusalem (which epistle was translated out of the Greek by St. Jerome, showing that it is likely that Jerome disliked not the doctrine of the same), writes a fact of his own, which most clearly declares the judgment of that notable learned bishop concerning the use of images: his words are these: "When I came to a village called Anablatha, and saw there, as I passed by, a candle burning, and enquiring what place it was, and learning that it was a church, and had entered into the same to pray, I found there a veil or cloth hanging at the door of the same church, dyed and painted, having on it the image of Christ, as it were, or of some saint—for I remember not well whose it was. Then, when I saw this, that in the church of Christ, against the authority of the Scriptures, the image of a man was hung up, I cut it in pieces," &c. And a little after: "And commanded that such manner of veils or cloths, which are contrary to our religion, be not hanged in the church of Christ."

Out of this place of Epiphanius divers notes are to be observed:—

First, that, by the judgment of this ancient Father, to permit images in churches is against the authority of the Scriptures, meaning against the second commandment: "Thou shalt not make to thyself any graven image," &c.

Secondly, that Epiphanius rejecteth, not only graven and molten, but also painted images; for if he cut in pieces the image painted on a veil hanging at the church door, what would he have done if he had found it over the Lord's table?

Thirdly, that he spareth not the image of Christ; for no doubt that image is most perilous in the church, of all other.

Fourthly, that he did not only remove it, but with a vehemency of zeal cut it in pieces; following the example of the good King Hezekiah, who brake the brazen serpent and burnt it to ashes.

Last of all, that Epiphanius thinketh it the duty of vigilant bishops to be careful that no such kind of painted images are permitted in the Church.

Serenus, Bishop of Massilia, broke down images, and destroyed them, when he saw them begin to be worshipped, (Greg. in Regist., epist. cix.)

Experience of the times since has declared whether of the

two sentences were better. For since Gregory's time the images standing in the Western Churches have been overflowed with idolatry, notwithstanding his or other men's doctrine; whereas, if Serenus's judgment had universally taken place, no such thing had happened: for if no images had been suffered, none could have been worshipped; and, consequently, no idolatry committed by them.

THIRD PART.

To recite the proceedings in Histories and Councils about the matter of Images, would require a long discourse, but it shall be sufficient here briefly to touch a few.

It is manifest, to them that read histories, that not only emperors, but also divers and sundry councils in the Eastern Church, have condemned and abolished images, both by decrees and examples.

Petrus Crinitus, in his book of "Honest Discipline," (b. ix., c. 9) wrote out of the emperors' books these words: "Valens and Theodosius, the emperors, wrote to the pretorian prefect in this sort: 'Whereas we are very careful that the religion of Almighty God should be kept in all things; we permit no man to cast, grave, or paint the image of our Saviour Christ, either in colours, stone, or other matter: but wheresoever it be found, we command it to be taken away, punishing them most grievously that shall attempt anything contrary to our decrees and empire.'"

Leo III., a man commended in histories for his excellent virtues and godliness, by public authority commanded abolishing of images, and in Constantinople caused all the images to be gathered together on a heap, and burned them to ashes.

Constantine, his son, assembled a council of the bishops of the Eastern Church, in which council it was decreed as follows: "It is not lawful for them that believe in God through Jesus Christ, to have any images, either of the Creator or of any creatures, set up in the temples to be worshipped; but rather that all images, by the law of God, and for the avoiding of offence, ought to be taken out of churches." Which decree was executed in all places where any images were, either in Greece or in Asia. But in all these times, the bishops of Rome, rather maintaining the authority of Gregory, than, like Christian bishops, weighing the peril of the Church, always in their assemblies allowed images.

Not long after, the bishop of Rome, practising with Tharasius, patriarch of Constantinople, obtained of Irene, the empress, her son Constantine being then young, that a council should be

called at Nice, in which the Pope's legates were presidents, which appeared well by their fruits; for in that council it was decreed, that images should not only be permitted in churches, but also worshipped; which council was confuted by a book written by Charlemagne, the emperor, calling it a foolish and arrogant council.

Soon after this council, arose a sharp contention between Irene, the empress, and her son, Constantine VI., the emperor, who destroyed images. And in the end, as she had before wickedly burned the bones of her father-in-law, Constantine V., so afterwards unnaturally she put out the eyes of her son, Constantine VI.

To be short, there never was anything that made more division, or brought more mischief, into the Church, than the controversy of images; by reason whereof, not only the Eastern Church was divided from the Western, and never since perfectly reconciled, but also the empire was cut asunder and divided, and the gate opened to the Saracens and Turks to enter and overcome a great part of Christendom. The fault whereof most justly is to be ascribed to the patrons of images, who could not be contented with the example of the primitive Church, being most simple and sincere, and most agreeable to the Scripture—for as Tertullian saith: “What is the first, that is true, and that which is later is counterfeit”—but with all extremity they maintained the use of images in churches, whereof no profit nor advantage ever grew to the Church of God. For it is evident that infinite millions of souls have been cast into eternal damnation by the occasion of images used in place of religion; and no history can record that ever any one soul was won unto Christ by having of images. But lest it might appear that the Western Church had always generally retained and commended images, it is to be noted that in a council holden in Spain, called the Eliberian Council, the use of images in churches was clearly prohibited in this form of words: “We decree that pictures ought not to be in churches, lest that be painted upon the walls which is worshipped or adored.”

But, notwithstanding this, experience hath declared, that neither assembling in councils, neither writings, preachings, decrees, making of laws, prescribing of punishments, hath holpen against images, to which idolatry has been committed, nor against idolatry whilst images stood. For these blind books and dumb schoolmasters (which they call laymen's books) have more prevailed by their carved and painted preaching of idolatry, than all other written books and preachings in teaching the truth, and the horror of that vice.

Having thus declared unto your Highness a few causes out of

many which move our consciences in this matter, we beseech your Highness most humbly not to strain us any further, but consider that God's word threateneth a terrible judgment unto us, if we, being pastors and ministers in his Church, should assent unto the thing which in our learning and conscience we are persuaded tendeth to the confirmation of error, superstition, and idolatry, and finally, to the ruin of the souls committed to our charge, for which we must give an account to the Prince of pastors at the last day, (Heb. xiii. ; 1 Peter v.) We pray your Majesty also not to be offended with this our plainness and liberty, which all good and Christian princes have ever taken in good part at the hands of godly bishops.

St. Ambrose, writing to Theodosius the emperor, useth these words (Epist. lib. v. ; Epist. xxix.), that is to say : "Neither is it the part of an emperor to deny free liberty of speaking, nor yet the duty of a priest not to speak what he thinks." And again : "In God's cause whom wilt thou hear, if thou wilt not hear the priest, to whose great peril the fault should be committed ? Who dare say the truth unto thee if the priest dare not ?" These and such like speeches of St. Ambrose, Theodosius and Valentinianus, the emperors, always took in good part ; and we doubt not but your Grace will do the like, not only of whose clemency, but also beneficence, we have largely tasted.

We beseech your Majesty also, in these and such like controversies of religion, to refer the discussion and deciding of them to a synod of your bishops and other godly learned men, according to the example of Constantinus Maximus, and other Christian emperors, that the reasons of both parties being examined by them, the judgment may be given uprightly in all doubtful matters.

And to return to this present matter, we most humbly beseech your Majesty to consider, that besides weighty causes in policy which we leave to the wisdom of your honourable counsellors, the establishment of images by your authority shall not only utterly discredit our ministers as builders up of the things which we have destroyed, but also blemish the fame of your most godly father, and also of such notable fathers as have given their life for the testimony of God's truth, who by public law removed all images.

The almighty and everlasting God plentifully endue your Majesty with his Spirit and heavenly wisdom, and long preserve your most gracious reign and prosperous government over us, to the advancement of His glory, to the overthrow of superstition, and to the benefit and comfort of all your Highness's loving subjects.

ABSOLUTION (THE CASTLE OF COMFORT).

BY

THOMAS BECON, PRESBYTER AND CONFESSOR.

THAT God alone absolveth the truly penitent, and only forgiveth the sins of so many as, with unfeigned faith and hearty repentance, convert, turn, and flee unto his mercy, it is manifestly proved by divers texts of the holy Scripture. First, let us hear what God himself saith by the prophet: "I am he, yea, I am he, indeed, which putteth away thy sins; yea, and that for mine own sake; and I will remember thy sins no more. Call to remembrance, and let us be judged together. Tell if thou hast anything that thou mayest be justified. Thy first father sinned, and thy prophets have trespassed against me." Are not these words evident enough? God the Father, perceiving right well that there should arise false anointed and false preachers, which, without all shame, would arrogantly arrogate and proudly challenge to themselves that power of forgiving sin which alone pertaineth to him, plainly here affirmeth, that he alone putteth away our sins; and, because he would have us the more seriously and earnestly to believe it, he repeateth this word, *I*, twice, saying: "I am he, yea, I am he, indeed, which putteth away thy sins; yea, and that for mine own sake." And lest any man should think that one may more forgive another his sins (I speak of those sins which are between God and our conscience, and not of the brotherly reconciliation), he affirmeth that our first father, Adam, and all prophets and preachers, have sinned; so that of them no remission of sins is to be looked for. Can flesh purify the soul? "That which is born of flesh is flesh" (saith Christ). "All have sinned (saith St. Paul), and want the glory of God." Again: "God hath wrapped all nations (saith he) in unbelief, that he might have mercy on all." If all be sinners, flesh, and the children of wrath; if all be hypocrites, unprofitable servants, earth, dust, and ashes; if all be the enemies of God, and unfaithful; how dare we be so bold as to take upon us one to forgive another their sins? Is a traitor a meet man to purchase a pardon of a price for another traitor?

Can one traitor forgive another his treason? Can one sinner forgive another his sin? Of the unclean what can be made clean? As Job saith: "Who can make him clean that is conceived of unclean seed? Is it not thou alone, O Lord?" It is the Lord alone, indeed, as David saith: "Thou, O Lord, shalt sprinkle me with hyssop, and I shall be made clean; yea, I shall be made whiter than snow." And as our Saviour Christ said unto Peter: "If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with me." If God washeth us not from our filthiness, we have no part in the heritage of Christ. Again, the aforesaid prophet saith: "The Lord is our judge, the Lord is our law-giver, the Lord is our king, and he it is that shall save us." How often is *the Lord* here repeated, to show that it is he alone which worketh all good things in us, which forgiveth our sins, and saveth us; yea, and none but he alone. Again, the Lord himself saith, by the same prophet: "I am the Lord, and there is no Saviour besides me." Here God himself confesseth that he alone is the Lord, and that there is none other Saviour besides him; that is to say, none that forgiveth sin and giveth eternal life, but he alone. By another prophet he also saith: "Thy destruction, O Israel, cometh of thyself; only of me cometh thy help and salvation." David, that holy king and godly prophet, knowing his deliverance from sin to be of God alone, stirreth up his inward man to magnify the Lord, saying: "Magnify the Lord, O my soul, and all that are within me praise his holy name. O, my soul, bless the Lord, and forget not his benefits; for he it is that pardoneth all thine iniquities, and that healeth all thy diseases; yea, he it is that delivereth thy life from destruction, and crowneth thee in mercy and loving kindness." Again: "Let Israel trust in the Lord; for with the Lord there is infinite mercy and plenteous redemption: and he it is that redeemeth Israel from all their sins." Whosoever, therefore, taketh on him to forgive sin maketh himself a saviour, and saith, with the angel apostate, "I will climb up above the high clouds, and I will be like unto the Most High." But let him know that pride will have a fall, and that the Lord is a jealous God, and will give his glory to none other. Who delivered Adam from everlasting damnation, when he, with his wife, had transgressed the commandment of the high Lord? Who absolved Noah from his drunkenness? Who delivered Lot from the uncleanness which he committed with his daughters? Who saved Moses, and forgave him his manslaughter? Who absolved David from his adultery? Who had compassion on the Ninevites, when they repented, believed, and converted? To be short, who forgave and absolved all the patriarchs, kings, pro-

phets, priests, with all other of the Old Testament, when they acknowledged their sins, and returned unto the Lord their God with faithful repentance, but only God alone? To whom did they flee for remission of sins, but to God alone? In whom did they put their affiance and trust, but in God alone? As the Psalmist testifieth, saying: "Our fathers trusted in thee, O Lord; yea, they trusted in thee, and thou deliveredst them. They cried unto thee, and they were made safe; in thee, O Lord, they trusted, and were not confounded." Are not these the words of blessed David? "I said, I will confess my sins unto the Lord, and thou forgavest the wickedness of my sin." Here is no mention made of Aaron. or of any of that priesthood; nor yet of pope, patriarch, cardinal, archbishop, bishop, priest, or of any other man, to forgive us our sins, but of God alone. So followeth it, that the Lord alone remitteth the ungodliness of our sins, and that he alone absolveth, *a pena et culpa*. This was godly doctrine in the Old Testament; neither was he counted, of godly men, any heretic, that taught this kind of learning at that time. God was then the Lord alone, omni-sufficient for all his people that truly repented and converted to his immeasurable mercy; neither had he need, at that time, of any other to be conjoined with him; as he himself said unto Abraham: "Fear not, Abraham; I am thy defender, and thine altogether sufficient rewarder." And is the Lord's hand now so abbreviated and shortened that he can save no more? Or is his ear so stopped that he cannot hear? Lord God, what a sudden change is this! But I steadfastly believe that he is the same Lord now that he was in the old time, and of no less power to remit sin at this present than he was many thousand years before these our days; inasmuch as he abideth ever one, and is not changeable; as he saith by the prophet Malachi: "I am the Lord, and am not changed."

Hitherto have I been bold, in few words, to prove that, in the time of the old law, God alone forgave the sins of his people, without the help either of bishop, prophet, priest, Levite, or any other, that the whole glory of their salvation might be ascribed to him alone. Now let us also labour to declare, that God alone doth the very same thing in the New Testament; that he alone may still remain the God of health, against the pestilent doctrine of the wicked Papists, which so vainly labour to maintain their usurped power and feigned authority, to the great obscuring of God's glory; and that to him alone all honour and praise may be given.

We read in the holy Gospel, that when a certain man, being diseased of the palsy, was brought unto Christ to be made whole,

Christ said unto him, "Son, be of good comfort; thy sins are forgiven thee." The scribes, hearing these words of forgiving sin, thinking within themselves that Christ was not God, but man only, and that it was the office of God alone to remit and forgive sin, spake on this manner within themselves: "Hic blasphemat"—This fellow blasphemeth; or, as Mark and Luke writeth, "Who is he that speaketh blasphemies? Who is able to forgive sin but God alone?" Here the scribes, rendering more the glory of God than our Papists and Pharisees do at this time, could not abide that Christ, whom they judged only man, should challenge to him power to forgive sin, seeing that alone pertained to God. And upon this place of the Scripture many write that the scribes erred not in this confession, that God alone forgiveth sin; but in this they say they were deceived, because they believed not that Christ was both God and man. If Christ had been nothing but man, he had blasphemed indeed; that is to say, taken that thing upon him which is the office of God alone; but forasmuch as he was not only man, but also God, he blasphemeth not—he challenged nothing but that was his right: so did the scribes and not Christ blaspheme. Let all men, therefore, learn of this history, that God alone forgiveth sin. Doth not Christ also, in the aforesaid chapter of Matthew, call himself a physician, and show that he came to call sinners unto repentance, and to make them whole? Why calleth he himself a physician, but because it is his office to cure and heal? Jeremiah prayed unto this physician, saying: "Heal me, O Lord, and I shall be healed; save thou me, and I shall be safe; for thou art he whom I will magnify." For he did know full well that all other physicians were unprofitable without his help, and no more meet to cure sick consciences of themselves, than the old lion was to heal the horse, of whom Æsop writeth in his fables, which, notwithstanding, took on him to practise physic, when of that same science he was altogether ignorant. Moreover, Christ calleth all them that labour and are laden to him, and promiseth that he will refresh, ease, and comfort them. He sendeth them not away to other, but calleth them all, without exception, to him; whereby he sheweth that no creature, neither in heaven nor in earth, can truly and sufficiently heal our infirm and sick consciences, but he alone which saith, "I am the resurrection and the life: he that believeth in me, although he be dead, shall live; and every one that liveth and believeth in me shall never die." For who can forgive me my sin, but he alone which is without all sin? Who can deliver me from death and hell, but he alone which hath overcome them both? Who can make me good, but he alone which only is good? Who can

make me wise, righteous, and holy, but he alone which is appointed of God the Father to be our wisdom, righteousness, and sanctification? Finally, who can ingraft in me life and virtue, but he alone in whom is all hope of life and virtue? Therefore, full well doth Christ call so many as labour, and are laden with the burden of sin, to him, and promiseth that he will refresh them; that is to say, absolve and deliver them from their sins. Hereto belongeth the saying of blessed John the Baptist: "Behold that Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world." Here blessed Baptist confesseth, that it is Christ alone which absolveth and taketh away the sin of the world. Doth not also the holy evangelist, St. John, in the aforesaid chapter, call Christ that true light, which lighteneth every man that cometh into this world? What other thing is it to lighten, than to put away the clouds of sin, and to send into our hearts the radiant and glistering beams of the eternal Son, which is the knowledge of God's most holy will? And this, saith St. John, is the office of Christ alone. Why doth Christ call so many as thirst unto him, and promiseth that floods of living water shall flow out of their bellies; yea, and that he will give them the water of life freely? But only to show, that whosoever is thirsty, and heartily desireth remission of sins, must with all haste come to him, and say, with the psalmist, "Like as the hart desireth the water-brooks, so longeth my soul after thee, O God. My soul is athirst for God; yea, even for the living God," &c. Furthermore, Christ commandeth that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name: where we may learn that forgiveness of sin cometh only by the name of Christ. And in the Acts of the Apostles we find, that when any famous and notable act or miracle was done, the people, as many at this day, did ascribe it to the virtue and power of the apostles—willing to do sacrifice unto them for it; but the apostles did reject and cast away all such unmerited honour and undeserved praise, contending, and mainly labouring to persuade the people, that whatsoever was done, came not to pass by their power, but by the virtue of Jesus Christ, whom God raised up from death. And when they made mention of remission of sins, they did never remember and rehearse their own power to forgive sin, but only preached, that so many as believed and were baptized into the remission of sins, should be absolved and freely forgiven by the name of Jesus Christ. And in the Acts of the Apostles blessed Peter plainly confesseth, "that there is no health, no life, no remission of sins, but in Christ alone; and that there is none other name given unto men under heaven wherein they must be saved but the name of Jesus Christ alone."

Neither did the apostles absolve any, otherwise than by the preaching of God's word ; which, when it was heard and believed, then were the diligent hearers and faithful believers of the same truly absolved ; as Christ saith : "Now are ye clean for the word's sake that I have spoken unto you ;" that is, now are ye delivered from your sins, because ye have believed my preaching. "The faith of the heart justifieth," saith St. Paul. Where it may be learned, that if faith be not given to the word, there is no absolution or deliverance from sin ; for "whatsoever is not of faith is sin ;" and where faith is not, there abideth the wrath of God ; as holy John the Baptist saith : "He that believeth the Son, hath everlasting life ; but he that believeth not the Son, shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth upon him. Therefore, before Christ absolveth any man of his sins, he did behold and see whether he had faith or not. If Christ found true faith in his heart, then he always said, "Thy faith hath saved thee." Seeing, then, that none can search the heart, whether it be faithful or unfaithful, but God alone ; seeing also that the absolution beareth no strength but where faith is ; it followeth that none can absolve me of my sins but that Lord alone which searcheth the reins and the heart. The priest is only God's minister, appointed of God (if he be truly sent) to preach that absolution and free deliverance from my sin, through the name of Jesus Christ ; which preaching, if I believe, I am so sure to be delivered from all my sins as though Christ himself had said unto me, "I freely absolve thee," or "Thy sins are forgiven thee for thy faith's sake in my name." Are not these the words of Christ, which is himself truth, and cannot lie, spoken to all faithful ministers ? "He that heareth you, heareth me ; and he that despiseth you, despiseth me ; and he that despiseth me, despiseth Him that sent me." But let us rehearse more Scriptures ; although, to any Christian heart, these which hitherto I have recited may seem abundantly to suffice. Blessed Paul, in his Epistle to the Romans, proveth manifestly that God alone justifieth us : "If our justification cometh from God alone, then followeth it well that the remission of our sins cometh from God alone also ;" for remission of sins goeth before justification. "By Christ's death are we delivered from our sins, but by his resurrection are we justified and made righteous." So doth it evidently appear, that it is God alone which both remit-teth the sin and also justifieth the sinner for Christ's sake ; which is our righteousness. Again, the aforesaid apostle saith, "that God hath not only given us his Son, but also all things with him ;" ergo, absolution of sins. So see we that God alone absolveth and forgiveth us our sins for Christ's sake. St. Paul,

to the Galatians, affirmeth, "that Christ gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us from this present evil world ;" that is to say, from all evil in this present world ; ergo, God alone it is which delivereth us from our sins in this vale of misery. "Ye are washed away from your sins (saith he) ; yea, ye are sanctified and made righteous by the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God ;" ergo, our absolution, our deliverance from sin, our sanctification, our justification, and all that ever good is, cometh from God, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Again he saith : "God the Father hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings ;" ergo, with the blessing of absolution and free deliverance from all our sins. "God hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and carried us into the kingdom of his beloved Son, by whom we have redemption, even, by his blood, remission of sins ;" ergo, by Christ's blood are we absolved and delivered from our sins. "Every good gift, and every perfect gift (saith James), cometh from above, and descendeth from the Father of light ;" ergo, absolution, which is a good and perfect gift, cometh down from the Father of light. Blessed John, in his epistle, saith : "If we confess our sins, God is faithful and righteous to forgive us our sins, and to make us clean from all iniquity." Here St. John affirmeth that God forgiveth us our sins, and maketh us clean from all unrighteousness. He saith also "that the blood of Jesus Christ, God's own Son, maketh us clean from all sin." And in the chapter following he saith : "If any man sinneth we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ that righteous one : and he it is that obtaineth mercy for our sins ; not for our sins only, but for all the world also." Again he saith : "I write unto you, O ye little children, that your sins are forgiven you, for Christ's name sake." Here see we again, that by Christ remission of sins cometh to us from God the Father. Moreover, blessed John, in his Revelation, writeth on this manner : "Christ hath loved us and washed us from our sins by his blood." Here see we that all our sins be washed away by Christ's blood alone. What should I write more ? If I go forth to gather together all the places of holy Scripture that prove the absolution of our sins to come from God alone, I should not only trouble the most godly reader, but also write a volume more prolix than the Iliads of the Greek poet, Homer ; when, to any Christian judgment, I may justly seem already to have proved my article true and sufficiently Christian, unto the great shame of all these Papists, which cease not with their stentorious voices to speak evil of the true preachers of God's word, and to obscure or deface the glory of God. Take away the power of only remitting sins from

God, and what remaineth there wherefore we should confess ourselves bound to him? I speak of matters concerning the salvation of our souls. If all that be of the shaven nation have power to absolve men of their sins at their pleasure, and to remit or retain whose iniquities it pleaseth them, then is God well promoted, even out of the hall into the kitchen, as they used to say: so should it also follow, that as many as pleased the priests should have their sins forgiven them, and so be saved; otherwise not. O, intolerable blasphemy! But as God alone remitted the sins of the fathers of the Old Testament, so in like manner doth he now in the New Testament. Who absolved Mary Magdalene from her sins, but Christ? Who forgave the thief his robbery and manslaughter but Christ? Who had compassion on Peter, when he denied his master Christ, but Christ? Who made of Matthew, the publican and toll-gatherer, a faithful apostle and preacher, but Christ? Who is that good Shepherd that fetcheth home the stray sheep, lovingly upon his shoulders, unto the sheep-fold; is it not Christ, which saith of himself, "I am that good shepherd. A good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep?" Who received home joyfully the lost one; was it not Christ? Who healed the wounded man; the priest or the Levite, or rather Christ, the Samaritan? Who made of Saul the persecutor, Paul an apostle; was it not Christ? Who absolved all these, with many other in the Scripture, from their sins, but Christ alone, the Son of the living God? Doth not all power belong to Christ, both in heaven and in earth? To him, therefore, alone doth the power of remitting sin pertain. Seeing, then, that this is true, and nothing more true, why may we not be bold to say, maugre the Papists, that God alone absolveth the truly penitent, and only remitteth the sins of so many as, with an unfeigned faith, convert and flee unto his mercy? If this be heresy, which we only confess and teach, I could allege divers sentences out of the holy doctors of Christ's Church which maintain this doctrine; but seeing I fight not for the advancement of man, but for the glory of God, I will not satisfy this my work with man's doctrine, but with the infallible verity of God's word; for I know that "every man is a liar, but God is true, and his word abideth for evermore."

Now will I prepare myself to the second part of this treatise, and afterwards make answer to the objections of the adversaries; that God may still remain a glorious God in the presence of all men, and all other accounted dust and ashes in comparison of him. The second part of this treatise is this: as concerning the priest, he forgiveth not the sin, but only is a minister of God, appointed to utter and declare that free remission of sins

purchased for us of God the Father by the most precious blood of Jesus Christ. This maketh the Papists to cry “ad ignem, ad ignem;” for this doctrine plucketh them down one staff lower than they were before. They may now become no more checkmate with God; for before they were not only not contented to be his ministers, but also they would be hale fellow well met with him. Now shall they be fain either to be the messengers and servants of God, or else plain Antichrists and Papists. But let us see what the Scripture saith. That the priest forgiveth not sin, but God alone, it is sufficiently proved before. Now must we learn of the holy Scriptures whether the priest be but only a minister appointed of God to utter and declare the absolution and free deliverance from sin, or not. That this is his office, it is manifest by divers places of the New Testament. When Christ sent forth his disciples he said unto them on this manner: “Go into the universal world and preach the Gospel to every creature; whoso shall believe and be baptized, he shall be saved; but whoso will not believe, shall be condemned.” Here it is evident enough what authority priests have, and what their office is—verily, to preach the Gospel and to baptize. Mark that! they must preach the Gospel, as St. Paul saith: “Christ sent me not only to baptize, but to preach the Gospel.” Again: “Woe is unto me if I preach not the Gospel.” And in the description of a spiritual minister he sheweth that such an one ought to be chosen as is not only learned, but also apt to teach, able to exhort with wholesome doctrine, and to convince and overcome them that speak against the truth of Christ’s Gospel. And St. Peter saith: “Ye elders, feed the flock of Christ so much as in you is.” What other thing is it to preach the Gospel, than to declare unto the people that their sins be forgiven them freely of God, if they repent and believe in Christ? as it is written: “He that believeth the Son hath everlasting life.” If sins be forgiven of God, and the ministers commanded to declare that same to the people, then doth it follow that they forgive not the sin, but only are ministers appointed of God to publish that benefit of our salvation. If a prince pardoneth his subject for his treason committed against his person, and sendeth his letters of favour to the traitor by one of his faithful servants, commanding him to declare his pitiful mercy to the guilty, who forgiveth the fault, the messenger or the king? I am sure it will be answered, the king—and not unjustly; for the prince alone pardoneth; the messenger only declareth his prince’s pleasure to the traitor. Even so, all we have offended, and worthily deserved eternal death. Now the good pleasure of our most mighty Prince is to forgive us even of

his own free mercy, without our deserts or merits, for Christ's sake ; and, that his unspeakable goodness toward mankind may be known, he hath appointed his ministers to publish it abroad. The sum of their commission is this—that whosoever will repent his former life, and believe to have remission of their sins through the mercy of God in Jesus Christ our Lord, they shall be forgiven. The ministers of God publish this joyful news—exhort unto repentance and faith. The people repent and believe, their sins are forgiven. Who forgiveth the sins of the faithful repentant ; the granter of the commission, or the declarer thereof ? God or man ? I doubt not but that ye will answer, God. If God alone, whom we offend, forgiveth the sin, and not the declarers of the forgiveness, I have got that I have desired for the probation of the second part of this little treatise. But let us hear what Christ saith : “As my Father sent me so send I you.” Now, I pray you, how was Christ sent, and for what purpose ?

Let us hear what he himself saith : “And then shall I be blameless.” By the prophet Isaiah he speaketh on this manner : “The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the Gospel to the poor ; he hath sent me to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captive, and sight to the blind ; freely to set at liberty them that are bruised, and to preach the acceptable year of the Lord.” Again he saith : “I must preach the glad and joyful tidings of the kingdom of God to other cities also ; for therefore am I sent.” Once again he saith : “Let us go into the next towns, that I may preach there also ; for therefore am I come.” All these sentences declare manifestly that Christ was sent to preach the kingdom of God ; that is to say, free deliverance from sin to so many as repent and believe. If they will not be above Christ, they must be contented to preach the will of the celestial Father, as he was, and not to take upon them that thing whereof only they are ministers. Doth not St. Paul, James, Peter, and Jude, call themselves the servants of Jesus Christ in all their epistles ; declaring thereby, that they are not the self Master by whom remission and absolution of sins cometh, but only the ministers of Him which infundeth and poureth into all men grace, favour, remission of sins, and everlasting life ? There is but one Master, that is to say, Christ ; the other are servants, as St. Paul witnesseth : “We preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord ; and we your servants for Jesus' sake.” Again : “Let a man this wise esteem us, even as the ministers of Christ and stewards of the secrets of God.” All these texts declare manifestly, that priests, if they be true ministers, and not rather idols, are nothing

but ministers and servants appointed of God to declare unto the Christian congregation that free remission of sins cometh unto us from God alone, through the glorious name of Jesus Christ : so far is it off, that the priests, contrary to their commission, can forgive sins, whose office consisteth in declaring, and not in giving, remission of sins ; therefore let them be contented no more, from henceforth, arrogantly to arrogate that unto them which pertains to God alone, but humbly confess that God only forgiveth the sin, and that they are but commissioners appointed of God to publish and set forth the same—I mean the remission of sins given to the faithful penitent of God alone. Neither let them frown at this doctrine, which setteth them in their right place ; but rather (as it becometh good and faithful servants) let them give the glory of our salvation to God alone, and be glad that they are called unto so worthy and honourable office to declare the mysteries of God to the people ; whose preachings or sermons, whosoever believeth, may be so certainly assured of the remission of their sins as though God himself had said unto them, “Your sins are forgiven you.” For this saying of Christ is an infallible verity : “He that heareth you heareth me.” Now let us behold the objections of the Papists, and briefly confute them, that all the glory may be the Lord’s. First, they allege this saying of Christ : “Loosen him and let him go away.” Again : “Loosen them and bring them unto me.” Here is simple poor shift to prove their absolution, when they are compelled to flee unto the untying of a vile rope, and loosening of a simple rude ass. Look wheresoever the Papists find any word that cometh of this verb *solvo*, that maketh for absolution straightways. I marvel how this escaped them : “Solve quod debes.” I think if “salve regina” had been turned into “solve regina,” as some of them that be not very fine mouthed pronounce it, they would not have been ashamed to have alleged it for absolution, even as some of the Papists do, which, wheresoever they find *ignis*, take it for purgatory straightways. O, noble doctors of tyrology, rather than of theology !

As concerning the first text, which is, that Christ commanded that Lazarus should be let loose, and suffered freely to go his way ; if they will gather their absolution of that, it may then be proved that all other men and women have that same power as well as they ; for there were at that time present, not only the disciples of Christ, but also divers Jews, with certain women, which I am sure were not all priests. Have they not made a good market ? They have brought a shilling to sixpence ; yea, rather to nothing. They have done fair by themselves, by my fay. While they labour to make themselves gods, and to excel

all other in dignity, they go so wisely to work, that they have made themselves equal to the most inferior. O crafty daubers. Which of them all is able to prove that Christ spake these words—"Loosen him and let him go"—rather to his disciples than to all the other indifferently? I think rather that he spake them to the women, as most commonly occupied about such things. But to whom he spake, the text maketh no mention; therefore can they prove nothing.

As touching the loosening of the ass, who seeth not their foolishness? The occasion why Christ sent the disciples for the ass, was not to give them power to loosen men from their sins at their pleasure, but to fulfil the prophecy of Zechariah, which so long before prophesied that Christ should come riding meekly upon an ass, contrary to the expectation of the ambitious and vain-glorious Jews. What is this to the purpose? Whereas Christ, by this example, teacheth humility, the Papists gather pride. Christ submitteth himself even with the most low, and they exalt themselves with the Most High; yea, above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; and sit in the temple of God, and show themselves as God. Tell me, good reader, are not these sweet allegory makers? I would they would once cease to moralize, for they have lied too long.

Some of them also allege this saying of Christ: "Whatsoever thou shalt bind on the earth shall be also bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loosen on earth shall be loosened in heaven." Here they esteem themselves more than gods. By this text they think they may do whatsoever pleaseth them; save or condemn, bind or loose, hold up or cast down, build or subvert, bring to heaven or cast down to hell; but if the good men would take the pains to look what goeth before, their comb should soon be plucked down; they would not make so much of their painted sheath. Christ saith a little before: "I will give them the keys of the kingdom of heaven." He saith not, I give them. Christ, in this place, only promised the keys to the congregation, and performed his promise after his resurrection, as we may see in the gospel of John. Hereof may the Papists right well perceive, that this text, whereof hitherto they have so greatly gloried, and out of the which they have sucked so great advantage, maketh little unto the advancement of their feigned power.

Their last and most strong bulwark, where the keys were given to the true ministers, is this text: "Whose soever sins ye forgive, they are forgiven unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained." Here they triumph, and persuade themselves that they have gotten the victory, though they never

fight stroke ; but if they will be favourable to God, and work no injury to the other Scriptures before rehearsed, they shall have no cause to lift up their bristles. Christ speaketh here after the manner of our speech, which diligently must be noted, unless we will deprive God of his glory. When we see a man restored to his health, which long before hath been vexed of some grievous disease, and is made whole through the diligence of some physician, we used to say, "Doctor Turner made this man whole," or Doctor Byll, or some other which is expert in that kind of science ; and yet is it not the doctor that made him whole, but rather the plasters and medicines that he administered unto him ; yea, rather God, if we will speak truly, which gave such virtue to his creatures to work health unto the sick. So doth the Scripture speak. Sometimes it attributeth our health to the ministers of the word, as in this aforesaid place ; sometimes, and most commonly, to God himself, as we before have abundantly heard ; and sometimes to the word of God, as it is written : "Now are ye clean, for the word's sake which I have spoken unto you." Item, "Neither herb nor plaster hath healed them, but thy word, O Lord, that healeth all things." Hereto pertaineth the saying of the psalmist : "He sent his word, and healed them, and delivered them from their destruction ;" and yet doth God only make us whole and forgive us our sins, as he himself witnesseth by the prophet, saying, "Thy destruction, O Israel, cometh of thyself ; only of me cometh thy help and salvation." What can be more plainly spoken ? Who is able once to hiss against these things ? Who will once open his mouth to bark against this doctrine ? No man, I suppose, except he be altogether drowned in Papism. This, therefore, is the true meaning of the aforesaid text : whensoever the ministers of the Lord's word declare unto me the sweet promises of God the Father, made to me in Christ's blood, and I believe them, then are my sins forgiven me at the very instant ; but if I do not believe them, then are my sins retained, that is to say, not forgiven. And forasmuch as I either repent and believe, or else continue still in mine old damnable state, at the preaching of the Lord's ministers, therefore the Scripture attributeth my deliverance from sin, or otherwise, to them, when, notwithstanding, God alone remitteth my sin if I repent and believe. If I do not, the uncircumcision of my heart, that is, my incredulity and unfaithfulness, is the occasion that my sins are retained, and not forgiven. For this saying always must needs abide true : "Thy destruction, O Israel, cometh of thyself ; only of me cometh thy help and salvation." So that the priests (I mean the ministers of God's word) are

counted to forgive sin when they preach to the truly repentant remission of sins through Christ, and to retain sin when they declare to the unfaithful damnation, and that the wrath of God abideth upon them so long as they remain still in their incredulity and unfaithfulness; as it is written: "He that believeth not on the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth upon him." Thus see we that those texts of the holy Scripture which the Papists allege for the maintenance of their feigned and usurped power in remitting sin, maketh nothing for their purpose, if they be truly alleged and understood according to the vein of the holy Scriptures. The Scriptures of God may not be rent and torn, neither hacked nor wrested, to serve the private affections of men; but every text must be so weighed, pondered, alleged, and understood, that it may agree with the other texts of the Holy Bible, that all the glory of our salvation may be ascribed to God alone, which is both the beginner and finisher of all our health; to him, therefore, be all honour and praise for ever. Amen.

Now will I make haste to the last part of this treatise, which requireth that I should express my mind concerning the keys which Christ before his passion promised to his Church, and after his resurrection performed his promise; and show, by the sacred Scriptures, that the gift of the keys is no vain and idle gift, but a necessary, joyful, and comfortable treasure. For the Papists will here object, if remission of sins cometh from God alone, then were the keys given to the congregation in vain. But to the intent that I may stop the mouths of the adversaries, and that they may have no occasion to bark against the glory of God after this, mark well, good reader, what shall be spoken. Truth it is that God alone teacheth men his verity by the Holy Ghost; as it is written: "All shall be taught of God." Again: "I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh, and your sons and your daughters shall prophecy." The psalmist also saith: "I will hear what the Lord speaketh in me;" yet will he that they should be studious of the holy Scriptures both day and night, as it is commanded of Christ. Search the Scriptures, and also diligently hear the preaching of his word; as it is written: "He that is of God heareth the words of God." "My sheep hear my voice. Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice." So, in like manner, although God alone remitteth all sin, yet will he that remission of sins should be preached to the people, that by this means they may repent, believe, and be made whole; as Christ testifieth, saying: "It behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise again from death the third day; and that repentance and remission of sins should be

preached in his name among all nations." "Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." For the ministers of the Gospel are the organs and instruments of Christ, by whom God worketh, through his Holy Spirit, health and salvation in so many as are predestinate unto eternal life. They are God's labourers and ministers by whom we believe, even as the Lord giveth every man grace. They are the orators, messengers, interpreters, angels, apostles, and ambassadors, of the Lord; as the apostle saith: "All things are of God, which hath reconciled us unto himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given us the office to preach the atonement." "For God was in Christ, and reconciled the world unto himself, and imputed not their sins unto them; and among us hath he set up the word of atonement." Now, then, are we messengers in the room of Christ, even as though God exhorted by us. We beseech you now, therefore, in Christ's stead, that ye be at one with God. Again, to the Galatians, he writeth on this manner: "Ye did not despise nor abhor me, but received me as an angel of God; yea, even as Christ Jesus." Hereto pertaineth his saying to the Thessalonians: "He that casteth away us, casteth not away men, but God, which hath given his Holy Spirit unto us." Moses also, in times past, said to the people that murmured against him: "The Lord hath heard your grudging and murmuring wherewith ye murmur against him. For what are we? Your murmurings are not against us, but against the Lord." So likewise read we in the Gospel, that the Lord spake of his ministers: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that receiveth whomsoever I shall send, receiveth me; and he that receiveth me, receiveth him also that sent me." Again he saith: "He that heareth you heareth me, and he that despiseth you despiseth me, and he that despiseth me despiseth him also that sent me." Here see we that the ministers of God's word are not to be despised; for they are necessary instruments unto the health of men, and they are worthy of double honour, as the apostle saith. Therefore may it be concluded that the absolution of the priest is not to be despised, seeing it is none other thing, if it be a true and Christian absolution, than the preaching of free remission of our sins in Christ's name. And although "he that planteth be nothing, and he that watereth be nothing, but God which giveth the increase;" again, "Albeit the Lord blesseth us with all spiritual benediction;" yet, inasmuch as the inestimable kindness and manifold benefits of God toward us cannot be known nor believed without preaching (for faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God), therefore hath God appointed his ministers to open and declare unto men

those excellent mysteries, those comfortable and joyful promises of God's mercy and good-will towards mankind, that they may perceive, learn, and understand, what is given them of the Lord, what they ought to believe, how they should obtain the gifts of God, and lead a life worthy the kindness of so bounteous a Father. God also hath appointed the ministers to beget men in Christ Jesus by the Gospel, to open the eyes of the blind, to turn them from darkness to light, to convert the hearts of fathers into children, and the disobedient to the wisdom of the righteous. He hath commanded them to preach repentance and remission of sins, in his name, unto all nations. "Go your way (saith he) into the world universal, and preach the Gospel to every creature." "He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved. He that believeth not, shall be condemned." Moreover, he hath given to his faithful ministers the keys of the kingdom of heaven, that whatsoever they loosen in earth may be also loosened in heaven, and whatsoever they bind in earth may also be bound in heaven; that is to say, he hath committed to them the office of preaching the Gospel, that they should go forth into the world and preach unto all men the grace and favour that is given of God the Father for Christ's sake; yea, and that they should proclaim, publish, and set abroad, unto all men, that so many as repent and believe are loosened from the captivity of Satan, purged from sin, delivered from death, and made inheritors of eternal life. Again, that so many as believe not, remain still the captives and bond-slaves of Satan, and continue bound in their sins, and in the state of damnation; and that, therefore, they shall die the death and for evermore be damned, except they repent, turn, and believe. And thus their preaching is so certain and sure before God, that whatsoever they pronounce, being conformable to the word of God, shall as certainly come to pass as though God himself had spoken it. As, for an example, whensoever the ministers and preachers of God's word in this world shall declare to the faithful repentance, remission of sins, and tell them that they be loosened from the captivity of Satan, it is even as certain and sure as though God himself had said these words unto them: "Thy sins are forgiven thee." In like manner when they shall say to the unfaithful, that they remain still bound in their sin, and that the wrath of God abideth upon them, and therefore they shall be damned, God approveth their saying, and it shall undoubtedly come to pass according to their preaching; so that whatsoever the minister of God's word saith, according to the word of God, ought to be received with great reverence, and taken as an oracle sent down from heaven, and undoubtedly believed as a manifest and infallible verity of God.

And this preaching of remitting or retaining sins are the keys of the kingdom of heaven, which Christ promised his apostles before his death, as we may see in Matthew, and after his resurrection performed his promise, as we read in the Gospel of St. John. And, by a metaphor, Christ called the preaching of his word a key; for as a key hath two properties, one to shut, another to open, so hath the word of God. It openeth to the faithful the treasure of the gifts of God—grace, mercy, favour, remission of sins, quietness of conscience, and everlasting life; but to the unfaithful it shutteth all his treasures, and suffereth them to receive none of them all, so long as they persist and remain in their incredulity and unfaithfulness. These keys are given to so many as, being truly called unto the office of ministration, preach the word of God. They loosen; that is to say, they preach to the faithful remission of sins by Christ. They also bind; that is, they declare to the unfaithful damnation. But he that preacheth not the word of God, can neither bind nor loose, though he challenge never so great dignity, authority, and power. For Christ calleth it the key of knowledge; and the prophet saith, “The lips of a priest keep knowledge, and at his mouth shall they require the law, for he is the angel or messenger of the Lord of Hosts.” Therefore, where there is no knowledge, there is no key: and where there is no key, there is neither opening nor shutting; that is, neither binding nor loosing. Here let all men judge what is to be thought of the Papists’ absolution, whereof they talk so much, which also they sell dearly. If no remission of sins cometh from them, but by preaching God’s word, it followeth that their absolution availeth but little, seeing they never preach neither the law of God nor the sweet promises of him, but only mumble a few words in the Latin tongue; yea, and this is not understood: so likewise many times contrary to the divine Scriptures and the glory of God. Miserable, doubtless, is that congregation which hath a blind guide for their curate, which hath neither the gift nor the knowledge of preaching: for “if the blind lead the blind, both fall into the ditch.” Again, greatly fortunate is that parish, and highly blessed of God, to whom a learned shepherd hath chanced, who can feed them with knowledge and doctrine. Whatsoever they shall hear of such a learned and godly minister, let them believe it as a voice coming down from heaven; and so often as, by such a shepherd, remission of sins in the blood of Christ is preached unto the congregation, let them esteem that preaching none otherwise than if the Lord himself had preached it. Let them steadfastly believe the word of God, and undoubtedly, by their faith, through the

grace of God, they shall obtain remission of all their sins. Contrariwise, if they believe not, their sins are retained, and by no means forgiven.

These things have I spoken concerning the absolution of the keys, which consisteth only in preaching God's word, that the Papists may have no occasion justly to bark against me, as they have done hitherto both for my sermons and books. God forgive them, and send them a better mind. Now, forasmuch as the true and Christian absolution is nothing else but the preaching of free deliverance from sin by the death of Jesus Christ, it ought not to be contemned and despised, but rather to be received with great humility and reverence, even as a divine oracle sent down from the Father of lights; for no man can express how greatly it comforteth infirm and weak consciences, which are troubled with the fear of God's judgments. When the prophet Nathan came unto King David, and rebuked him for slaying Uriah the Hittite, and for taking his wife Bathsheba unto his wife, and told him how greatly God was angry with him, and what plagues should fall upon his house, yea, upon himself, for his wickedness, it is not to be doubted but that David was stricken with a wonderful great heaviness, and his heart pierced with an inward sorrow, insomuch that he was right ashamed of himself, of his fault, of his wickedness, and was compelled even of conscience to burst out into the knowledge of his sin, and to say, "I have sinned against the Lord." As David was now full of sorrow, grief, trouble, disquietness in his heart, and had joy of nothing (unto such shame and confusion was he brought in his conscience); so likewise it is not to be doubted but that he was wonderfully revived, marvellously restored unto the peace and quietness of his conscience, yea, and plenteously replenished with joy in his mind, when the prophet said these words unto him: "The Lord hath put away thy sin, thou shalt not die." Mary Magdalene was a famous sinner, and when she heard her unclean conversation rebuked by the Word of God, she heartily repented, and was replenished with an inward sorrow, lamenting greatly that she had offended so bounteous a Lord and merciful God, insomuch that a large fountain of tears flowed out of her tender eyes. All this time, undoubtedly, her sorrow was greater than it can be here expressed; but when she heard this comfortable absolution of our Saviour Christ: *Remittuntur tibi peccata*—"Thy sins are forgiven thee;" again, "Thy faith hath made thee safe; go thy way in peace;" that is to say, with a quiet and merry conscience; O, good God, who is able to express with how great joy and singular solace she was affected? So sure and comfort-

able is it to weak and troubled consciences to hear the sweet and comfortable words of our free deliverance from the grievous burden of sins by Christ's blood. The thief was full of great anguish and trouble in his conscience, when he hanged upon the cross, in the time of Christ's passion, and confessed that both he and his fellow thief suffered worthily, even according to their deserts; and in the midst of his troubled conscience he cried unto the Lord Christ on this manner, saying: "Lord remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom." But when Christ had made him answer and said, "Verily I say unto thee, this day shalt thou be with me in Paradise;" O, with what a quiet conscience suffered he his pains, and with how glad a heart yielded he up his spirit into the hands of the eternal Father: so comfortable a thing is it to a troubled conscience for to hear anything that may quiet it. Again, when blessed Peter preached unto the Jews, and told them that they had crucified Christ the Lord, the Scripture saith that they were pricked unto their hearts, and said unto Peter, and unto the other apostles, "Ye men and brethren, what shall we do?" Peter said unto them, "Repent, and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." As they were greatly dismayed when the holy apostle opened unto them their malicious fact in slaying Christ the Lord, so were they very much comforted when they heard of St. Peter that there was hope of their sins to be forgiven; so that they repented them of their wickedness, and were baptized in the name of Jesus Christ. With how entire and unspeakable sorrow is it to be thought, that the famous and notable adulterer among the Corinthians was overwhelmed, when at the commandment of St. Paul he was delivered unto Satan, excommunicate, put out of the Christian company, and reputed among them as an ethnic and publican. Contrariwise, with what exceeding joy was he replenished, when, after his repentance and sorrow, he heard the sweet promises of God's mercy declared unto him, that lieth bent out toward all sinners that repent in faith, and afterwards was received into the company of the faithful Christians. I pass over divers other histories, both of the Old and New Testament, which do abundantly declare what great comfort the faithful penitent sinners have alway had in hearing the comfortable promises of God's mercy. Now the absolution being, as I said before, nothing else but the preaching of free deliverance from sin, by the death of Jesus Christ (for God alone forgiveth sin and absolveth the faithful penitent), it ought not to be contemned and despised; but whensoever the minister

of the Lord's word, be it privately or openly, shall rehearse unto men the sweet and comfortable words of God's mercy towards all them that repent in faith, they ought to give earnest faith unto them, being undoubtedly persuaded that their sins at that time be assuredly forgiven them as though God himself had spoken these words, according to this saying of Christ: "He that heareth you, heareth me." But it were expedient that all true ministers should pray that their form or manner of absolution be pure, and agreeable to the vein of the holy Scriptures, without the intermixture of any man's authority in remitting sin, either of Peter, Paul, Francis, Dominic, Benet, or any other, or yet of themselves. Again, that it be declared to the penitent that God alone forgiveth sin, and that the priests are but the ministers of God, to whom he hath given the keys of the kingdom of heaven, for to show to the true penitent loosening, that is to say, remission of their sins; to the obstinate and hard-hearted sinners binding, that is, that they remain still in the danger of damnation, and shall be damned except they repent and believe. It would also be provided, that when the faithful penitent is desirous to have his conscience confirmed, established, and comforted, with the word of God, it should not be mumbled in the Latin tongue, as the Papists have hitherto used in their absolutions, but in the mother tongue, that the idiot and unlearned may understand it, and be edified. Or else what faith shall he conceive in his heart? How shall he repent? How shall he know the goodness of God towards sinners? How shall he arm himself with faith against Satan, sin, and desperation? How shall he prepare himself to give God thanks for his kindness, and live worthy of his profession? God grant that all things may be done unto his glory, and unto the profit of his holy congregation.

Here hast thou, most godly reader, my mind concerning the absolution and forgiveness of sins, which, if it be examined by the Scriptures of God, all man's doctrine set apart, I doubt not but it will stand so strong that the gates of hell shall not once be able to prevail against it. Farewell, most gentle reader, and pray that the Lord's word may have free passage, that the name of the Great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ may be glorified among all nations, and that, all dissension laid aside, we may agree in one faith and one truth. Amen.

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

BY THE MOST REVEREND FATHER IN GOD,

JOHN BRAMHALL, D. D.,

LORD ARCHBISHOP OF ARMAGH.

TO SIR HENRY DE VIC, ABOUT A PASSAGE AT HIS TABLE, AFTER
THE CHRISTENING OF HIS DAUGHTER, ANNE CHARLOTTE.

Of Persons dying without Baptism.

SIR,

THE discourse which happened the other day, about your little daughter, I had quite forgotten, till you were pleased to mention it again last night. If anything did fall from me which gave offence to any there present, I am right sorrowful, but I hope there did not; as on the other side, if any occasion of offence had been given to me, I should readily have sacrificed it to that reverend respect which is due to the place, your table, anciently accounted a sacred thing, and to the lord of it, yourself. This morning lying musing in my bed, it produced some trouble in me to consider how passionately we are all wedded to our own parties, and how apt we are all to censure the opinions of others before we understand them; while our want of charity is a greater error in ourselves, and more displeasing to Almighty God, than any of those supposed assertions which we condemn in others, especially when they come to be rightly understood. And to shew that this particular breach is not so wide, nor the more moderate of either party so disagreeing, as is imagined, I digested these sudden meditations, drawn wholly, in a manner, from the grounds of the Roman schools; and so soon as I was risen, I committed them to writing.

First—There is a great difference to be made between the sole want of baptism upon invincible necessity, and the contempt or wilful neglect of baptism when it may be had. The latter we acknowledge to be a damnable sin, and, without repentance and

God's extraordinary mercy, to exclude a man from all hope of salvation. But yet if such a person, before his death, shall repent and deplore his neglect of the means of grace, from his heart, and desire with all his soul to be baptized, but is debarred from it invincibly, we do not, we dare not pass sentence of condemnation upon him, nor yet the Roman Catholics themselves. The question then is, whether the want of baptism upon invincible necessity do evermore infallibly exclude from heaven?

Secondly—We distinguish between the visible sign and the invisible grace; between the exterior sacramental ablution and the grace of the sacrament—that is, interior regeneration. We believe that whosoever hath the former hath the latter also, so that he do not put a bar against the efficacy of the sacrament by his infidelity or hypocrisy, of which a child is not capable. And therefore our very liturgy doth teach, that a child baptized dying before the commission of actual sin is undoubtedly saved. Secondly, we believe that without baptismal grace (that is, regeneration), no man can enter into the kingdom of God. But whether God hath so tied and bound himself to his ordinances and sacraments that he doth not or cannot confer the grace of the sacraments, extraordinarily, where it seemeth good in his eyes, without the outward element—this is the question between us.

Thirdly—We teach that the case is not alike with little infants born of Christian parents, who die unbaptized, without their own fault, and men of age and discretion, such as Nicodemus was, to whom Christ said, "Except ye be born again of water and of the Spirit, ye cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven." These latter can have no hope of salvation in an ordinary way, except they be baptized either in deed or desire. But we dare not pass a definitive sentence against the former, whose want of baptism is not their own fault, but the fault of their parents, seeing that God hath said, that "as he lives the son shall not bear the iniquity of his father." Yet do we not believe that the children of Christian parents do derive any inward or inherent sanctity by propagation (as is by some imputed to us, amiss). We know well that a Christian begets not a Christian. But that holiness which St. Paul ascribes to the children of believing parents, "If the root be holy, so are the branches," we expound of an exterior or ecclesiastical sanctity, or a right to the sacrament of baptism by the privilege of their birth, being not born foreigners, but natives and freemen of the Church. And forasmuch as they have a right to the sacrament, but are defrauded of it without their own defaults,

we believe that God, who hath not limited his grace to his outward ordinances, may and doth many times, according to his good pleasure, supply the defect of others, and operate in them the grace of the sacrament by his Holy Spirit. That this is truth, I prove by five arguments, drawn out of their own grounds.

First—If the grace of the sacrament be communicable without the sacrament, then there is a possibility of salvation without actual baptism. But the grace of the sacrament is communicable without the sacrament, as appeareth in martyrdom, which is generally confessed to supply the defect of baptism. “Whosoever shall lose his life for my sake, shall save it,” (Luke ix. 24). And “Blessed are they who suffer persecution for righteousness sake, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven,” (Matt. v. 10). If it be observed that martyrs are baptized in their own blood, I answer that martyrdom, indeed, is sometimes called baptism, improperly and analogically, because it supplies the want of baptism; but it is no sacrament, no proper or true baptism, because wanting the essentials of the sacrament—the matter, which is water, which element, and no other, Christ consecrated in Jordan to the mystical washing away of sin; as also the form—“I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.” This is one exception without contradiction.

Secondly—St. Paul saith (2 Cor. viii. 12), “If there be first a willing mind, it is accepted, according to that a man hath, and not according to that he hath not.” God binds no man to impossibilities, which are not made impossible by himself. When actual baptism cannot be had, the desire of baptism is accepted for baptism itself. As St. Ambrose saith of Valentinian, that he was baptized in his desire. Thus much is acknowledged by all Roman Catholics, and may be collected out of the Council of Trent. If it be objected that the desire of baptism can have no place in infants, for the defect of reason, I answer two ways—first, there may not be the same invincible necessity for an infant which is for a person of age and discretion; as suppose the mother should be delivered of child in a desert, where there is no water, and die before either the water can be brought to the infant, or the infant to the water; the child wants the use of reason to desire baptism; the parents do desire it for the child, but want means to procure it; shall they christen it with sand, as it was sometimes done to a Jew in the like case, at the instant of death? This would be no celebration, but a bold presumption, and profanation of the holy sacrament. How much better were it to commit it to the secret and extraordinary mercy of God, who hath not bound his power

to the sacraments, as all divines do agree. What reason can be given why necessity should dispense with the want of actual baptism, and yet the same necessity should not dispense with the want of an actual desire of baptism? especially seeing the want of desire in infants proceeds from an absolute and antecedent necessity, but the want of the sacrament in persons of years might have been prevented, and is become invincibly necessary by their own fault, which deserves the less consideration. Secondly, I answer, that Gerson, and Gabriel, and Cardinal Cajetan, great doctors in the Roman Church, do maintain, that when baptism cannot be actually applied to infants, the desire of their parents to have them baptized is sufficient for their salvation. Those doctors were more merciful to infants, to whom Christ gave so many expressions of his love, than the rigid controvertists of these times. The best is, whether they be wheat or chaff, yet men's tongues or pens must not winnow them; "they must stand or fall to their own Master." This is called *baptismus flaminis*—the baptism of the Spirit.

Thirdly—The Roman schools do define concerning such abortive infants as perish in their mother's womb, both under the law of nature, and of Moses, and of grace, that except they be slain for Christ's sake, as some have been, and so become martyrs in deed, though not in will, because they are not capable of election, that *ex æquo et lege communi*—in equity and by ordinary right—they cannot be saved; but withal they add, "that it is not to be denied but that by some other means or remedies extraordinary they may be saved, if so it shall seem good to God in his extraordinary providence." But abortives have no greater privileges than those who live to behold the light. Therefore we ought not to censure them for want of the ordinary means, but to leave them also to the extraordinary providence of God.

Fourthly—If infants which die unbaptized be excluded from all hope of salvation, then it is by reason of that original corruption which they derive by propagation from their parents, because "no polluted thing can enter into heaven," (for we know that infants are not capable of any actual sins). But this reason is not sufficient; for the Jewish infants were as subject to original sin, and had a remedy appointed for it by God, as well as Christians—that is, the sacrament of circumcision, which, though it should be admitted that it did not causally produce grace, yet it is confessed by the Romanists that it did certainly procure grace, and was as strictly enjoined to them as baptism is to us. "The uncircumcised male child shall be cut off from his people," (Gen. xvii. 14). But this notwithstanding,

the Jewish infants, dying without circumcision, might be saved. either is God more propitious to the Jewish infants than to the Christian, for "He hath loved the tents of Sion above all the tabernacles of Jacob;" therefore Christian infants may be saved likewise without baptism. That the Jewish children might be saved without circumcision, is thus proved by the institution of God. Circumcision was not celebrated till the eighth day after the nativity, but many thousand Jewish infants died before the eighth day, and consequently without circumcision: to exclude all those from hope of salvation for want of circumcision, which by God's own ordinance they might not have, intrencheth too much upon the goodness of God. More particularly, David's child died upon the seventh day, and yet David doubted not to say, "I shall go to him, but he shall not return to me," (2 Sam. xii. 23). David could not go to him either in hell or in *limbus infantum*. And of this opinion St. Gregory seemeth to be, as he is cited by the Master of the Sentences. "That which baptism doth with us, that same the faith of the parents performed in the law of nature," (Dist. iv., lib. 4). If in the law of nature, why not as well in the law of Moses and of Christ? Most certainly, if infants might be saved in any one of these three states, without some sacrament or other, then in all the three, without exception.

Fifthly—It is confessed that in the primitive times baptism was administered ordinarily but twice in the year—that is, at Easter and at Whitsuntide; and many did defer their baptism till the hour of death, that they might depart more undefiled out of this world. But considering those infinite dangers which hang continually over the heads of mortal men whilst they are in this vale of misery, and how many are swept away out of this life, even in an instant, by sudden death, by sickness, or other casualties, some sleeping, some eating, some walking—this practice had been the most unsafe and dangerous in the whole world, and the loss of millions of souls, if all persons dying unbaptized were infallibly excluded out of heaven; especially little infants, who, being incapable of reason, cannot supply the want of actual baptism by their hearty desires. I do not examine the grounds of this delay, neither do I justify the practice; but it argues strongly that they did not esteem the only want of baptism without contempt (or, as they conceived, neglect), to deprive all sorts of persons from hope of salvation.

You may be pleased to remember how it was urged that St. Austin was of the same faith with the Church of Rome in this particular; and it was then answered, that he did neither agree with them nor us in this question. St. Austin is in this a hard

father to little infants and innocents from actual sins, in that he concludes all, who die unbaptized, in hell. The Church of Rome teacheth contrarily, that they are not in hell, but in a certain *limbus infantum*. The Protestants leave them to the mercy of God, and doubt not but that many of them are in heaven. St. Austin saith they are certainly damned. The Protestants say they may be saved. The Romanists say they cannot be saved, and yet they are not damned. The Romanists say they suffer *pœnam damni*, but not *pœnam sensus*—a privative, but not a positive punishment. St. Austin saith they suffer, both privatively and positively, the very fire of hell. The Protestants believe that many of them do suffer neither. Observe the words of St. Austin:—

“The first place, the faith of Catholics doth believe, by divine authority, to be the kingdom of heaven, from whence he that is not baptized is excepted. The second, hell, where every apostate or stranger from the faith of Christ shall prove eternal torments. The third, we know not at all; yea, we do not find it to be in the holy Scriptures.” (Hypog. li. 5).

“Neither is there any middle place to any person, that he can be anywhere but with the Devil, who is not with Christ.” (Lib. de merit. et remis. peccat).

And in his eighteenth sermon upon the words of the apostle: “He that is such an one, let him choose now where he desires to dwell, when the time is that he may be changed; for there are two habitations, the one in the eternal kingdom, the other in eternal fire.”

And sermon 232: “Let no man deceive himself, brethren, for there are two places, and there is not any third. He that shall not merit to reign with Christ, without doubt shall perish with the Devil.”

The like he doth lib. xxi. de Civit. Dei., cap. xxv.

When we urge these places against purgatory, they answer that St. Austin speaks of eternal places, against Pelagius, who had invented a third place besides heaven and hell, for children which died unbaptized. And in the two first places, indeed, St. Austin speaketh expressly against Pelagius, but the others are general, neither distinguishing infants nor old men, temporal nor eternal mansions.

But leaving purgatory for the present, as not concerning the question which is now in hand, this makes more strongly against the Romish *limbus infantum*, which they themselves do make to be eternal, and against which, by their own confession, in this answer St. Austin disputeth. St. Austin saith, he knew no such place; he did not find it in holy Scripture: he saith, “He

that is not with Christ (that is, in heaven, where Christ is) is with the Devil (that is, in hell)." He makes no mean between an eternal kingdom and eternal fire--between reigning with Christ and perishing with the Devil.

To conclude. Infants unbaptized, according to St. Austin, must either be sheep or goats; either stand upon the right hand or upon the left; either hear "Come, ye blessed," or "Go, ye cursed;" either inherit a kingdom, or be cast into eternal fire, prepared for the Devil and his angels.

This is more than a mere loss of blessedness. But the Romanists do not, dare not say that all infants unbaptized are with the Devil, that they perish with the Devil, that they are in eternal fire. And therefore we may conclude, on the other side, that they are with Christ, that they enjoy an eternal kingdom, where they reign with their Saviour; or, at least, that some of them are crowned, some tormented, according to the good pleasure of God, whose extraordinary help is then often found, when the help of man doth fail.

This is all which was then mentioned, which I have reduced to its heads, and which I take to be the doctrine of the soundest English divines, and which I believe to be the truth; saving always my canonical obedience to my spiritual mother, the Church of England, and in a higher degree to the Catholic Church, when it shall declare itself in a true and free oecumenical council. But neither I nor any Protestants do believe that the Church of Rome, including all other Churches of that patriarchate, or of its communion, is that Catholic Church.

NOTES.

RIDLEY ON IMAGE WORSHIP.

BUT because, either through ignorance or malice, it is misreported to the people, who are made believe, that thereby we exclude the necessity of a godly life ; therefore I will briefly expound the meaning of this proposition, “By faith only we are justified.” Wherein there are three terms—the first is justification, and thereby we mean God’s acceptance of a sinner to grace and glory. For man being guilty of the breach of God’s law, and so subject to the penalty thereof, which is condemnation, cannot be restored again unless he bring a righteousness to satisfy this law again ; that is to say, which may answer both the obedience it requireth, and the punishment that it inflicteth. The reason hereof is, because the law being part of God’s will, and given to man out of the justice of God, must take his effect : else God should leave his justice unsatisfied, and depart from his nature, which is impossible. This righteousness we affirm to be not our own inherent justice, but the obedience of Christ alone, whereby he fulfilled the whole law most perfectly for us. We deny not but every servant of God hath in him true satisfaction and holiness, enabling him to repentance, satisfaction, faith, hope, and charity ; but we deny these or any of them to be the justice whereby the bond of God’s law is answered, and we appear righteous before God’s judgment-seat, partly because they are imperfect, and partly for that we do them not by our own strength.—*Dr. John White.*

Arg. 1. The Lord hath expressly forbidden the adoration of images, in the law, and the prophets, and in the New Testament.

Object. The Papists except against this argument, that God, in the places alleged, condemneth the idols of the heathen, which were images of false gods : but he condemneth not the images of the true God, in such apparitions as be made in the Scripture, nor the images of Christ and the saints.

Ans. The Lord condemneth in general all images and idols devised by man for worship and adoration (Exod. xx. 5 ; Levit. xxvi. 18). And the Israelites, erecting images in resemblance of the true God, are condemned (Exod. xxxii. 5 ; 1 Kings xii. 28 ; xvi. 22 ; 2 Kings xvii. 28). Also the adoration of the brazen serpent, an image of Christ (John iii. 14), and framed by divine precept (Num. xxi. 9), yet because it was adored, is destroyed (2 Kings xviii. 4). And the Lord, forbidding adoration of images, maketh such a description of them as agrees not only to the idols of the heathen, but to the images of Christians ; to wit, that they be the workmanship of a man’s own hands, have eyes and see not, ears and hear not, &c. (Isa. xliv. 13 ; Ps. cxv. 4 ; cxxxv. 15 ; 1 Cor. xii. 2). Also the continual practice of the Jews doth show what was the meaning of God’s law ; for, by virtue of the former precepts, they refused all images, and admitted no statues or

images, either of God himself, or the angels, or of Abraham, Moses, Elias, &c.

Arg. 2. The primitive Church for many ages condemned adoration of images—yea, all religious use of them. Some of them say, “There can be no religion where images are in use.” Augustine “condemneth worshipping or praying looking upon an image.” Ambrose saith, “God will not be worshipped by stones.” And Augustine, “Art thou not ashamed to worship that which a carpenter hath made?” Clement of Alexandria, “Christians are forbidden to exercise the deceitful art (of painting or carving images), for the prophet hath said, ‘Thou shalt make to thyself no likeness.’” And Jerome, “The worshippers of God may not adore images.” And Augustine, “They justly err which seek Christ and his apostles, not in sacred books, but on painted walls :” and he condemneth the worshippers of pictures. And Irenæus, Epiphanius, and Augustine, condemn the heretics which worshipped the images of Jesus and Paul. And some of our adversaries heretofore, and some Jesuits at this day, confess that the primitive Fathers abandoned images.

Bellarmino and Suarez pretend that heretics were condemned by the Fathers, not simply for having and using images, but because they did the same in an unlawful manner, and after the fashion of the Gentiles.

Ans. All imagery in divine worship is heathenish (1 Cor. xii. 2). Neither can our adversaries out of the Holy Scripture or Fathers, show us any rule for the lawful worshipping of images, more than for lawful adultery, or lawful cutting a man’s throat in private malice.

Arg. 3. Many famous Papists, in all ages, have condemned the worshipping of images, which proveth that this custom is not Catholic.

Holcot saith, “No adoration is due to any image, neither is it lawful for any man to worship an image.” And Durand, “Forasmuch as neither men nor angels ought to be adored, let them consider what they do, who, under pretext of religion and piety, do adore divers images ; for it is not lawful to worship anything made with hands.”

In a provincial synod holden at Mentz, it was thus decreed :—“Images are not set up that men should adore and worship them, but that they may be put in remembrance by them of things profitable.” And the same is the judgment of many famous Papists ; yea, our greatest Jesuits are divided concerning the manner of the adoration of images.

Arg. 4. No image made by a carpenter or founder doth so truly resemble God or the Trinity, as man doth, which is endued with grace (Eph. iv. 24 ; Gen. i. 26). But religious adoration is not due to such—no, not to the apostles (Acts x. 26), nor to angels (Rev. xix. 10). If, therefore, we may not worship those images of God with religious adoration which the Lord himself hath framed, is it not absurd to worship them which a carver makes ? And verily an ass deserveth more justly to be worshipped than an image, because an image is a dead block or earth, the other a living creature : and, accordingly, Clemens Alexandrinus saith—“Images are more vile than any living creature ; and all images being earth, I have learned to tread upon them, and not to adore them.”—*Dr. Francis White, Bishop of Rochester.*

BECON ON ABSOLUTION.

Every open sin committed by a man making profession of Christianity is triplex in its character; it is an offence against God—an offence against society—and an offence against *the Church*. It is an offence against God, for his holy law is violated; it is an offence against society, for its regulations are broken through; and it is an offence against the Church, because a disgrace is brought against the Christian name. So fully is this last position understood, that, in all ages, public acknowledgment has been required by the Church, and that not only when the Church was apostolically constituted, but even when Presbyterianism or Independency had taken the place of Episcopacy. Penance is required in the Kirk of Scotland, in the Establishment of Geneva, and, even in the Independent congregations of our day, “a brother who walks disorderly,” or who avows heretical opinions, is excommunicated.

Having premised thus much, we shall illustrate our statement by taking an instance—that of fraudulent gain; the party guilty has evidently offended God, his neighbour, and the Church. He may obtain forgiveness of God on repentance—from his neighbour on restitution (we put the law of man out of the question here, as it is but the generalized expression of “our neighbour”)—but how shall he obtain forgiveness of the Church? She, if her discipline be strictly carried out, has forbidden him to approach her altars—has cut him off from her communion, and this she has done by the voice of her priest, speaking her laws and in her name. He must, then, acknowledge his guilt and request forgiveness, and *then* the priest, again acting as the organ of the Church, declares, if he believes the penitence sincere, “I absolve thee from all thy sins.” This is a plain, absolute, and unconditional declaration—“By his (that is, Christ’s) authority, committed unto me, I absolve thee.” Now that our Church neither does, nor ever did, consider this to be a mere declaration of God’s pardon, is evident from two circumstances: first, because she *subsequently* requires the penitent to pray that God would “not impute unto him his former sins:” but if the form of absolution implied that God *had* forgiven them, why should the succeeding prayer—dictated by a truly humble and contrite spirit, and the whole tenor of which is to implore the Divine forgiveness—be offered at all? It would be absurd to pray for pardon after the pardon had been declared. But, no—the framers of our Liturgy meant no such absurdity: they directed the priest to absolve—that is, to forgive, absolutely; so far as the Church was concerned, to remove any ecclesiastical censure, if such had been incurred, and to dispense with them if they *would have been* incurred (for *this* absolution only takes place after confession, and not then, unless humbly and heartily desired). Then, after having been *absolutely forgiven*, on behalf of the Church, the penitent is again led to address the Almighty, in order that the *moral* and *spiritual* guilt may be forgiven.

But there is another reason which supports our view of the case, and it is—that a *priest* is required to read this or any other absolution; and a deacon is not permitted to do so. Now a *layman* has authority to declare, to all within hearing of him, that God’s mercy will be extended

to the truly penitent ; but he has no authority to forgive, on the part of the Church, those who have offended against the Church : and, consequently, the very requirement of a priest to pronounce it shows that it is something more than a mere declaration : in fact, that it means what it says. This too will explain, and explain satisfactorily, what has very much puzzled Mr. McNeile, and hundreds beside him—viz., those words in the ordination service, addressed by the bishop to the priest, “Receive thou the Holy Ghost for the work of a priest in the Church of God ; whose soever sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven ; and whose soever sins thou dost retain, they are retained !” This is the dread commission, the exercise of which we have seen in the visitation office—both perfectly intelligible when viewed in the light of antiquity, both monstrous and blasphemous, in the highest degree, if understood as Mr. McNeile would explain them.

But herein lies the difficulty to him and to all amenders of our Liturgy ; they view it in connection with our present ecclesiastical condition, and, perceiving the discrepancies between them, forget that our formularies are adapted to a strict and godly discipline, and that it is our duty not to lower the forms of the Church to the cold and lax standard of modern expediency, but to raise our practice to the warmth and self-devotedness required by the Church. Well did the Archbishop of Canterbury observe, when a petition was presented, praying that the rubrics might be altered to be conformable to the practice of the clergy—“that *if there were any discrepancy*, the practice of the clergy must be altered and made conformable to the rubrics.” We have one or two more remarks as to our three absolutions, which we must make before we quit the subject. The first is merely a declaration that God “pardoneth and absolveth all those who truly repent and unfeignedly believe His holy Gospel”—and goes on to pray for repentance. This is read in the full congregation, where, from the very nature of the case, no other form can be used, and many wicked, impenitent persons, and many absolutely excommunicate, may be present. The second is used at the administration of the Holy Eucharist, and, inasmuch as no excommunicate persons are present, and it is charitably presumed that *all* come in the fear of God, the declaration is changed into a prayer. Now, in these two forms, the forgiveness referred to is the forgiveness of God, not the forgiveness of the Church ; because the last, in the former case, could not reasonably be conferred—in the latter case it is not needed ; whereas, in the form for the Visitation of the Sick, it is both needed and conferred.

This is perfectly reasonable : if a child behaved himself undutifully towards his parent, we should desire him to seek forgiveness, not of God only, but of his parent also : and, if that parent refused to grant forgiveness, we should not suppose that *we* had authority to confer it in his name, unless the parent commissioned us so to do. It is true that the priest may refuse his absolution, but the penitent has done his duty in seeking it, and, *if honest*, is thereby absolved “*in foro conscientie* ;” just as the child who has behaved undutifully can do no more than express his sorrow for the past, and his determination to amend for the future.—*Church of England Quarterly Review*, No. 16.

BRAMHALL ON BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

For the comparison with the Articles, which expressly define baptism and original sin, abundance of observation is ministered both in the necessary erudition and in the Homilies. In the “*Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*,” that divine promise on which our Church relies as the sure and only ground of confidence, in regard to the regeneration and election of every infant in baptism, is particularly illustrated. Such was the belief expressed, at the same time, in the same office, by another of the Reformed Churches: “O Almighty God, which in commanding us to pray hast assured us, that we, believing steadfastly in thy promise, shall have all that we desire, specially concerning the soul, wherein we seek thy glory, and wealth of our neighbours; our humble petition to thee, O most dear Father, is, that forasmuch as this child is not without original sin, thou wilt consider thine own mercy, and, according to thy promise, send this child thy good Spirit, that in thy sight it be not counted among the children of wrath, but of light and grace, and become a member of the undefiled Church, spoused to Christ, thy dear Son, in faith and love unfeigned.” And thus to those who demand where God has obliged himself by any promise to apply his Spirit to the soul in a gracious operation, when the baptismal water is applied to the body, these collations will furnish the substance of a reply, which may be supported by the Book of God. The demand has been made; and the promise annexed to baptism “is to be found in several places of Scripture: I shall name but three—Acts xxii. 16, where Ananias advises St. Paul, in order to his thorough conversion, ‘to arise and be baptized, and wash away his sins,’ &c., which implies that Almighty God does derive pardoning and regenerating grace to us by baptism; St. John iii. 5, ‘Except one be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God;’ where our Lord expresses Christian baptism by the two principal parts, the Spirit and the water, of which this sacrament consists; and likewise implies, that both together are the means which he has ordained to work our conversion, and procure our admission into his kingdom and glory; and Tit. iii. 5, ‘According to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost;’ by which phrases the apostle means Christian baptism, St. Paul putting the two chief parts, washing and renewing, for the whole of it, and says, ‘both together accomplish salvation, if we ourselves, by our own wilful sins, do not hinder it.’ Now is not the Scripture’s mentioning the Spirit to concur with the water in baptism tantamount to a PROMISE, that in the due use thereof the Holy Spirit shall concur with it? These three texts prove that baptism is more than a mere initiating sign to the baptized parties (which is all that some of our opposers will allow it); even that it is a seal, too, of the pardon of their sins, and the only extraordinary means God has appointed for their conversion and salvation.”—*Todd on the Declaration of the Reformers. Preface*, pp. lvi. to lix.

Item, that infants must needs be christened, because they be born in original sin; which sin must needs be remitted; which cannot be done but by the sacrament of baptism, whereby they receive the Holy

Ghost, which exerciseth his grace and efficacy in them, and cleanseth and purifieth them from sin by his most secret virtue and operation.—*Articles of Religion*, 1536.

Flourishing in the latter half of the second century, St. Clement attests that, in his days, there were sundry persons still alive who had immediately conversed with the holy apostles, Peter, and James, and John, and Paul, and who had faithfully preserved and communicated to the theologians of his time and succession the true tradition of the blessed doctrine of the Gospel.

From some one of these, who probably had it from St. John, he received, of course when he was himself a young man, a very remarkable story—no concocted fable or mere ecclesiastical romance, as he expressly states, but a literally true narrative, which had been handed down to him, and which he had carefully treasured up in his memory. The story was this:—

St. John, in the discharge of his metropolitan duties, which extended specially over the Lesser Asia, had occasion to go to a city not far from Ephesus. Here he became acquainted with a youth, whose outward bearing and seemingly good disposition greatly interested him. His stay, however, could not be prolonged. Whereupon, at his departure, turning to the individual whom he had appointed bishop of that city, he solemnly, in the attesting presence of Christ and his Church, committed to his spiritual charge the young man whom he had deemed so promising a subject. The bishop accepted the charge, and after conducting him through the regular course of catechetical instruction, finally believing him to be sincere and devout, admitted him to the sacrament of baptism. After this, on the ground that the supposed neophyte was sufficiently defended by the baptismal seal of the Lord, the episcopal superintendence was slackened. But the judgment proved erroneous. The youth, left to the devices of his own evil heart, followed the natural, though hitherto unsuspected, bent of his inclination; and thence speedily joined himself to a troop of idle, and dissolute, and thoroughly profligate individuals, his equals in point of age. For a season, they indulged only in expensive and riotous living, but at length they organized themselves into a regular gang of marauding banditti. The charitably supposed regenerate and indisputably *baptized* convert exceeded them all in violence, bloodshed, and ferocity; whence, by acclamation, he was chosen to be their captain. Thus from bad to worse, matters went on for a season. In course of time business again brought St. John to the same city, and on his arrival, one of his first enquiries respected the promising youth, in whom he had felt so deep an interest. “Bishop (said he) pay me back the loan which, with the Church for our witness, Christ and I intrusted to you.” The bishop, not understanding him, thought that through calumny he was thus called upon to refund a sum of money which he had never borrowed; but the apostle soon undeceived him. “I re-demand at your hand (said he), the soul of the youth whom I intrusted to your pastoral care.” On this, groaning and weeping, “Alas! (replied the bishop), he is dead.” St. John promptly enquired how, and when, and by what death? “To God he is dead (rejoined the bishop), for he has fallen away to all evil

courses, until at length, becoming a robber, he has, instead of taking Christ's Church for his portion, occupied, with his abandoned associates, a mountainous wild, fit for their lawless purposes." Forthwith, at these lamentable tidings, after rebuking the bishop for his negligence, the holy and aged apostle rent his garments and beat his head; then having demanded and procured a horse and a guide, he took, without hesitation, the direct road to the formidable haunt of the robbers. Reaching their outposts, "Lead me (cried he) to your captain, for I am come specially to see him." The commander of the banditti, little at first suspecting the character of his visitor, received him armed as he was; but as soon as he perceived the well-remembered countenance of the venerable man, he precipitately betook himself to flight. "My son (cried his eager pursuer, regardless of his own age and infirmities), why fleest thou from thy old and unarmed father? Fear not; there is still in Christ a hope of thy salvation." At these oft-repeated exclamations, the robber chief first stopped with his eyes fixed to the ground, then throwing down his arms he burst into a flood of tears, wherewithal he was baptized as with a second baptism. Upon this (so the narrative concludes), the apostle led him back to the Church, and offering up abundance of prayers, and wrestling with him in prolonged fastings, and soothing him with words of hope and consolation, he desisted not until he had restored him to the Church; thus effecting a mighty example of true change of mind, and a signal indication of regeneration, even a trophy of such a resurrection from the spiritually dead as all men might openly behold.

On the exquisite beauty of this story, which Eusebius has happily transcribed from a now lost work of Clement, it is superfluous to descant.

It is here adduced simply in evidence: and it goes to prove, that, in the judgment of the earliest Church, sanctioned apparently by the voice of an apostle, and at all events in full harmony with that apostle's own written record, an unworthy recipient of baptism might hereafter, if truly penitent, obtain, either through the means of God's revealed word forcibly brought home to his soul, or through the means of a devout and believing reception of Christ the Saviour, that moral regeneration which, in his previous outward baptism, he had, by reason of his unworthiness or spiritual inaptitude, failed to obtain.

The conversion of the young man—so Clement received and recorded the statement—was a signal indication of regeneration; even a trophy of such a resurrection from the spiritually dead (the precise description of man in his natural or unregenerate state) as all might behold and admire.

Here we have no ambiguity. The moral change of mind, the metanœa, the transmutation, produced by the successful application of God's word and the powerful exhibition of Christ the Saviour, is explicitly declared to be, not a mere restoration to the beneficial enjoyment of an already communicated privilege, but actually, and absolutely, and unreservedly, the grace of regeneration itself: and the declaration, moreover, runs with such a complete appearance of unpremeditated familiarity, that we cannot equitably doubt its propounding the

universally received and accredited doctrine of the primitive Church, as a matter too notorious to require either apology, or softening, or explanation.

The youth, after he had been so remarkably induced to quit the life of a robber and an outlaw, is unreservedly declared, through St. John's prayers and effectual predication of God's word, to have been regenerated.

Consistently with this declaration, as he is said, by the bishop who baptized him, to have been, nevertheless, spiritually dead to God and the Church; so, upon his subsequent regeneration, he is said to have afforded a trophy of such a resurrection from a state of spiritual death as all men might clearly and palpably behold.

But yet further, we are assured that, upon making a fair outward profession, he had, anterior to his entering upon a course of sensual profligacy and lawless violence, been regularly admitted to the sacrament of baptism.—*Faber on the Primitive Doctrine of Regeneration.*

To assert generically is one thing, and to assert specifically is another; and we are prepared to show that our Church does the first with regard to *moral* regeneration, and the second with regard to federal regeneration. That Christ is formed in the heart of the baptized person, she asserts with reference to the class into which he has entered; trusting that, in answer to her prayers, it may be so with the individual. That the baptized person has commenced a new relation both with regard to God and the Church, having become a son, however disobedient, of the one—a member, however unworthy, of the other; that, in other words, he is *federally* regenerate—she asserts, not generically, but specifically—not in the judgment of charity, but as an undoubted and incontrovertible fact.

Now if this federal change of condition were all that the Church contemplated in the passages so often discussed, there would be an end of the difficulty; but she has done more than this, for she has spoken of spiritual benefits *inseparably* connected with baptism. We have already seen that these spiritual benefits do not consist in moral regeneration; for the Church acknowledges cases in which this blessing is not conferred at baptism, and points out certain other channels for its conveyance. She commands us to “acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins.” This passage in the Nicene Creed is founded upon two assertions of the evangelists: Mark i. 4, and Acts ii. 38. This latter is as follows: “Then Peter said unto them, Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins.” The primitive Church, in accordance with this Scripture, taught the remission of sins at baptism: to those who faithfully received that sacrament, *complete* remission and *moral* regeneration; but to *all*, remission and federal regeneration. That this doctrine was much misunderstood and grossly abused, we freely acknowledge. Nay, to such an extent was the misunderstanding and abuse carried, that many refused baptism till they were on their death-beds, trusting thereby to obtain, without any sacrifice, the kingdom of heaven. Constantine the Great was one who did thus. Still, as we are not entitled to argue against any doctrine from the abuse of it, the errors of Constantine and

others do not help us over the apparent difficulty by giving us a right to reject the tenet altogether. There is one view which may be taken which at once justifies the Church, reconciles her with Scripture, and acquits her, on the one hand, of making *moral* regeneration inseparable from baptism, and, on the other, of denying *any* inseparable spiritual benefit in that sacrament. This view is, that the *guilt* of original sin is *invariably* remitted, though, alas, the moral corruption of human nature remains. Now, as this original sin is the only guilt which can attach to an infant, and as the baptismal water, by a *modus operandi* of which we can know nothing, is the means of its remission, the whole *guilt* of the child is removed, and a spiritual as well as a federal blessing *invariably* conferred. But, on the other hand, as an adult has not only the guilt of Adam, but that of his own personal sins, to answer for, it is evident that neither the federal regeneration nor the remission of original sin can be sufficient for his salvation. He requires also a *moral* regeneration. Hence, the infant dying without baptism is left to the *uncovenanted* mercies of God—mercies which we know to be infinite, and which we humbly trust will be exercised towards it. At the same time, how great is the guilt of those who neglect to secure for their children God's *covenanted* blessings.—*Church of England Quarterly Review*, No. 17, Jan. 1841.

CHAPTER IV.

POPERY AND CATHOLICISM.

(CONTINUED).

SECTION 1. *Hooper on the Office of Christ.*

SECTION 2. *Turner on the Old and New Learning.*

PREFACE.

THE student of ecclesiastical history, who contemplates the disastrous reign of Mary, Queen of England, can scarcely avoid being struck with the unusual prominence accorded to five among the sufferers for conscience sake. This prominence arises not merely from their episcopal rank, though unquestionably that circumstance had its weight in the position assigned them among martyrs. Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, Hooper, and Farrar, are names become "familiar in our mouths as household words:" we identify them with the Marian persecution, and, standing out as they do in bold relief, their martyrdoms become the central and resting points in the most interesting picture of our Anglican Church history. It is the custom of the day to underrate Cranmer; but, without giving way to this tendency, it cannot be denied, that the five episcopal martyrs were men widely differing one from another, both in learning and sound judgment. It is, perhaps, to Ridley that we owe our Catholicity; it is to Cranmer that we owe many of the most important steps onwards in our Reformation; and Latimer well aided them both by his unflinching courage, his great influence, and the apostolical purity of his life and demeanour. But among those who urged forward the Reformation, there was many a man whose zeal was less tempered with knowledge, and who yet was eminently useful; there were forces acting in the right direction, though needing some restraining power; and we should give a very unfair and a very unprofitable picture of the Reformation, if we exhibited *all* its movers as unanims in the extent as well as in the nature of their objections to the Romish system. Of this latter class of men—men who felt that the Established Church needed purifying, but who looked solely to the recovery of certain doc-

trines—the most remarkable was John Hooper, Bishop of Gloucester and Worcester, a man who, as regards the rights of the Church, was an Erastian, and, as regards her discipline, a Latitudinarian. A Calvinist in doctrine, and a Puritan in practice, he was, nevertheless, one of the best and most useful men of his day; and while we know that his opinions are not always to be trusted, nor his judgment always to be relied on, we may yet derive much benefit from the writings which he has bequeathed us.

The mode, and the only mode, in which we can use Bishop Hooper as an authority, is to take those points on which all the Reformers were agreed; and we shall not unfrequently find that, on these points, he expresses himself with a force and fluency superior to most of his contemporaries. This may be partly accounted for, on the very ground that the better part of his faculties were absorbed upon the momentous questions he entertained; and the man who scrupled to use the surplice, and thought the square cap significant of Popery, became endued with a noble eloquence when speaking on the office and character of Christ. The works of Hooper are chiefly expositions of his faith, and, as the opinions of an unauthorized individual, they have but little value when compared with those which were subsequently embodied in the Articles and Formularies of the Anglican Church. It is as a reviver—not, indeed, of discipline, but of certain most essential doctrines; not of apostolical order, but simply of evangelical truth—that we are to regard the martyred Bishop of Gloucester; and not unprofitably will the time be spent in considering the deficiencies of his system, as well as the excellencies of his character.

In every age of the Church it has pleased God to work by human, and consequently imperfect, means; and the very imperfections of the instruments have been often the means of perfecting the work. It was not by a calm exposition of doctrine, by a logical address to the understanding, that the Reformation made its way among the uneducated classes; it was not with a fine razor that the blocks were hewn which form the foundation of the capitol. It might be that the *educated*—and the *educated* of those days were *learned*—received the doctrines of the restored truth after a due investigation; but, among the bulk of

the people, it was by strong, stern, indignant eloquence—by appeals to the passions and the prejudices—by hot zeal and violent declamation, that they made progress. Nor are we to think the less of it on this account. A certain degree of strong common sense catching the first and leading idea of any doctrine or system; an honest conviction that the preacher or speaker is in the right; a facility in exposing the arguments of an adversary, and more especially in turning them to ridicule; such are the elements of an eminent popular preacher at all times, and those thus endowed, whatever they may do with the scholar and the philosopher, will ever mould the multitude to their will. It will be self-evident, that the arguments used to a Ridley with success, are by no means, *therefore*, fit to be produced against a man of moderate abilities and violent prejudices; and as the mass of mankind are neither scholars nor philosophers, it will be necessary to have *popular* preachers to convince and convert them.

It will not be going too far, if we esteem Hooper as one of the popular elements in the Reformation movement—Ridley, as we have already observed, being one of the elements of Catholicity, and Cranmer a representative of that candour and absence of prejudice, which, however dangerous in excess, is, nevertheless, to be esteemed and admired.

It was by the united efforts of men so different, that the Reformation gained ground. Some, whose fervour was great, but who were better qualified to pull down than to build up, acted as pioneers, and broke up the fallow ground where more experienced labourers were to succeed them in cultivation; they pointed out to the good sense of the people the folly of such doctrines as purgatory, and indulgences, and the pardon *of the guilt of sin* by sacerdotal absolution; they asserted the non-superiority of the Bishop of Rome, and, armed with the Scriptures of truth, they demonstrated the fallacy of the doctrines which they opposed. But the weapons of their armoury, though mighty, were but few: what are *commonly called* the doctrines of grace may be comprised in a few lectures, and even the all popular topic of Romish corruption could only be *extensively* carried on before a learned audience. Such were the persons who

prepared the nation for the reception of a faith purer than that of Rome—more apostolical than that which they taught themselves. It must be remembered, that the homely parables and quaint similes of Latimer weighed more with the people than the patristic learning and logical accuracy of his colleagues. Hooper was a great *man*, where Ridley would have been but a great *name*. While these men thus prepared the nation for the change which the Reformation implied, and which was shortly to be established by an act of the Legislature, others were employed in training up teachers, or in writing works of controversy for the study of those who should be teachers; the younger members of the ecclesiastical body were imbued with the *apostolic spirit* as well as the *evangelical piety* of those who first promoted the revival, and they gradually disseminated their own principles—the principles of EVANGELICAL HIGH CHURCHMEN.

Yet as evil is, through the infirmity of human nature, mixed with every work of man, it is not to be concealed that the puritanical feeling which existed in the minds of such men as Hooper bore bitter fruit in times subsequent. The more fiery spirits, who could ill brook restraint and subjection, willingly sheltered themselves under the sanction of so eminent a man; he had exonerated them virtually from schism, and they took advantage of his permission; and it is highly probable that, had the scruples of Hooper been never published, and had less deference been paid to the opinions of Bucer and Peter Martyr, the tracts of Martin Marprelate would never have made their appearance. Of Bishop Hooper's life it will be sufficient to give the leading events, as well as those in that of Dr. Turner, the celebrated Dean of Wells.

He was born in Somersetshire, A.D. 1495, entered of Merton College, Oxford, 1514, graduated B.A. 1518, and is supposed to have embraced the principles of the Reformation about 1540. On account of this he was obliged to leave England—nor did he return until the accession of Edward VI. in 1547. He then settled in London, and preached frequently; but was thought, both by Cranmer and Ridley, to have too lax views as to Church Government. He was, however, created Bishop of Gloucester,

and subsequently held the see of Worcester *in commendam*. He suffered martyrdom at Gloucester, A.D. 1554, on February 9th.

The Rev. William Turner was born at Morpeth, in Northumberland, and educated at Cambridge, under the tuition of Bishop Latimer. He attained to great proficiency in philosophy, medicine, and theology. He was the author of many books in different branches of knowledge. He was imprisoned during the reign of Henry VIII., on account of his adhering to the principles of Luther: he, however, escaped into Italy. In the reign of Edward VI. he returned, and was made successively a Prebendary in the cathedral church of York, Canon of Windsor, and Dean of Wells. During the reign of Queen Mary, he was amongst the exiles on the continent; but was, on the accession of Elizabeth, restored to his dignities.—(*See Bishop Tanner, Bibliotheca Brit. Hib.*)

It may be well here to remark—and the observation may be made once for all—that though the Council of Trent wrought as it were into a system the Romanism of the times, yet it *fixed* little as necessary for salvation which had not been previously done at other Councils. The Council of Trent may be fairly taken as expressing the sentiments *long before* held by the Roman Church; and it is the more important to notice this, because that Council was contemporaneous with the most important part of the Anglican Reformation: this, too, may account for the practical adoption by many of the very unsafe maxim—“Go as far from Rome as you possibly can.”

Those who saw the chief pastors of the Romish Church met together, not to remove, but to confirm the corruptions of former ages, and rather inclining to diminish than to increase liberty of conscience (by which we mean, that some few doctrines which were previously left open to the convictions of the individuals were now fixedly defined by the Church)—those who beheld this were very likely to be carried away by an indignation so vehement, as to take up for their motto, “*Delenda est Roma.*”

The innovations sanctioned by the Council of Trent were, it must be borne in mind, not merely the *inventions*, but the DECREES of previous ages. Had they been otherwise—that

is, had those doctrines, which are commonly supposed to have been imposed as necessary to salvation by this celebrated Council, been really, then and there, thus for the first time imposed, then it would follow, that the Reformation in the Anglican Church was unnecessarily violent, and if not schismatic, at least tending towards schism. But the Council was not closed till the Reformation was completed ; and as the acts of a Council, though they may have a certain weight when first promulgated, cannot be valid till the closing of the Council has placed them beyond recal, so the Reformation of the Anglican Church, however contrary in spirit, cannot, contemporaneous as it was, be esteemed *canonically* contradictory to the decrees of the Council. The truth is, that the Reformation aimed a blow at earlier errors than any inventions of the sixteenth century—errors sufficiently enormous to have caused cardinals and bishops to plan a Reformation of the Roman Church itself.

C.

CAMBRIDGE,

The Feast of the Annunciation.

THE OFFICE AND CHARACTER OF CHRIST.

BY
JOHN HOOPER, B.A.,

BISHOP AND MARTYR.

CHAPTER I.

FORASMUCH as Almighty God, of his infinite mercy and goodness, prepared a mean, whereby Adam and his posterity might be restored again unto their original justice and perfection, both of body and soul, and to live eternally unto the same end that they were created for—to bless and magnify for ever the immortal and living God; it is the office of every true Christian, before all other studies, travails, and pains, that he shall sustain for the time of this brief and miserable life, to apply himself with all diligent force and labour to know perfectly this mean, ordained by God for our salvation; and, the thing once known, diligently, with heart, soul, and mind, to follow the mean, until such time as the effect and end be obtained wherefore the mean was appointed. The mean was shewed unto Adam at his first and original transgression—the Seed of a woman, which should break the head of the serpent, destroy the kingdom of the devil, and restore Adam, and as many as knew and believed in this Seed, unto life everlasting. And as the sin of Adam, the only occasion of all man's misery, was derived unto all his posterity, and made subject unto death and the ire of God for ever, so was this Seed, from the beginning, a very true and sufficient remedy to as many as believed; and God, for his promise sake, acquitted and delivered man from the right and claim of the devil, and by mercy restored the place that was by malice and contempt lost. He that would consider diligently these two things, the sin of Adam and the mercy of God, should find himself far unable to express, or sufficiently think, the greatness of the one or of the other, when they are so far passing the reason and understanding of man. All the solace and joy of Adam's posterity consisteth solely and only in this (Rom. v.): "Where sin abounded, grace did more abound." The benefits and merits of this Seed abound and are more available before the judgment of God than sin, the flesh, the devil, and the world. This treasure and inestimable riches must be perfectly known of every person that will be saved. It is only in Christ, and in the knowledge of him; what he is, and what is his office.

CHAPTER II.

What Christ is.

He is the Son of the living God and the perpetual Virgin Mary: both God and man, the true Messias, promised unto man from the beginning of his fall: whom St. John calleth the Word of Eternal Essence and Divine Majesty, saying: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God," (John i.) St. Paul (Col. i.) calleth him "the image of God," &c., and (Heb. i.) "the brightness of God." The creed of Nice calleth him "light of light," the natural Son of God, in whom dwelleth the fountain of all divinity naturally; as Paul saith (Col. ii.): "In Him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily;" meaning, that he is not the Son of God by adoption or acceptation into grace, as Abraham, David, and other holy saints, but naturally the Son of God, equal with the Father in all things; as John saith: "We beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father." So doth St. John prove him in all his writings to be the very true and everlasting God, and not, as Ebion and Cerinthus said, that he was but very man only. He was made mortal man, as John saith, "And the Word was made flesh," to save the damned man from immortal death; and to be a mediator and intercessor unto God for man, (Matt. xi., John iii., Isaiah xi.)

This Scripture doth not only teach us the knowledge of salvation, but doth comfort us against all the assaults, subtilties, and crafts of the devil—that God would of his inestimable love rather suffer his only Son to die for the world, than all the world should perish. Remaining always, as he was, very God immortal, he received the thing he was not—the mortal nature and true flesh of man, in the which he died; as Peter saith (1 Pet. iv.) Irenæus hath these godly words: "Christus fuit crucifixus et mortuus, quiescente verbo, ut crucifigi et mori possit."* The divine nature of Christ was not rent, or torn, or killed, but it obeyed the will of the Father. It gave place unto the displeasure and ire of God, that the body of Christ might die. Being always equal with his Father, he could, if he had executed his divine power, have delivered his body from the tyranny of the Jews.

These words of Irenæus do wonderfully declare unto us what Christ is, and agree with Paul (Phil. ii.): "Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God; but

* Christ was crucified and died—the Word not resisting that he might be crucified and die.

made himself of no reputation, and took upon himself the form of a servant." Seeing he was sent into the world to suffer this most cruel death and passion, he would do nothing that should be contrary to his vocation ; but, with patience praying for his enemies, submitted himself unto the ignominy and contempt of the cross ; suffering pains innumerable, without grudge or murmur against the holy will of his Father ; his Godhead hiding itself until the third day, when it restored the soul again unto the body, and caused it to rise with great triumph and glory (Rom. i., Matt. xxviii., John xx., Luke xxiv., Mark xvi.), repeating the doctrine that before his death he preached unto the world, that he was both King and Lord, High Bishop and Priest, both of heaven and of earth. "All power is given unto me, both in heaven and in earth ; go, therefore, teach all nations," &c. (Matt. xxviii.)

He, that before was most vile and contemptible in the sight the world, now, by right and just title, claimeth the dominion and empire of all the world. How mighty a Prince he is, the creation of the world and the preservation thereof declare. How merciful towards them that repent, we know by daily experience in ourselves, and by the example of others—Adam, David, Manasseh, and Peter. How cruel and rigorous for sin, the punishment that we suffer and the calamities of this world declare, especially the death of his most innocent body. How immortal his ire is against such as repent not, Saul, Pharaoh, Judas, with others, declare. How mighty and fearful a Lord this, our Saviour Jesus Christ, is, read his title and style (Nahum i.), where the prophet threateneth the destruction of Nineveh, and the whole kingdom of the Assyrians. As the princes of the world used to declare in their letters patent of what power, force, and strength, they be, and the names of the realms and dominions that they have under their protection and governance, to alarm their enemies, that they make no resistance, nor move the peace of so mighty a prince ; so such a title giveth the prophet unto God, to alarm the city of Nineveh and kingdom of the Assyrians, saying : "What do ye imagine against the Lord ?—he will make an utter end ; affliction shall not rise up the second time." This is the style of the God omnipotent, our Saviour Jesus Christ, in whose name all powers bow their knees, in heaven, in earth, and in hell, (Phil. ii.)

CHAPTER III.

Of the Priesthood of Christ.

Now that the Scripture hath taught us to know that Christ is both God and man, I will briefly entreat of his office ; first,

of his priesthood; then of his kingdom and reign over his Church till the world's end; then for ever in solace with his elect, in perpetual mercy and favour; but with such as contemn in this world his holy commandment and pleasure, in severe justice and immortal hatred and ire for ever, (John iii.)

St. Paul, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, proveth him to be the Priest, called by God unto that function and office of the High Bishop: "Christ glorified not himself to be made an high priest; but He that said unto him, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee. As he saith also in another place, Thou art a priest for ever, after the order of Melchizedec," (Heb. v.) By whose obedience unto the cross he gave everlasting health to as many as obeyed him. And in all things he executed the very true office of a bishop, to whom it appertained to teach the people; which was the chiefest part of the bishop's office, and most diligently and straightly commanded by God; as all the books of Moses and the prophets teach, and Christ commanded Peter (John xx.), and Paul all the bishops and priests of his time (Acts xx.)

Of Christ's authority and preaching, Moses and Stephen (Acts vii., Deut. xviii.) say thus: "A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me; Him ye shall hear." He that will not hearken unto his voice, shall be as none of the people of God. This authority to preach the Father gave unto him in the hearing of the apostles (Matt. iii. 17), and bound his Church to receive his doctrine, saying: "This is my dear beloved Son, in whom I delight; hear him." He taught the will of his Father unto the world, and how they might be saved from death infernal (John xvii. 6, Matt. xi. 5, 6, 7); so that they repented and believed the Gospel (Matt. iii., Mark x.) He left nothing untaught, but, as a good doctor, manifested unto his audience all things necessary for the health of man. As the woman confessed (John iv.): "Messias, when he is come, will tell us all things." He preached not only himself, but sent his apostles and disciples to manifest unto the world, that the acceptable time of grace was come, and the sacrifice for sin born into the world, (Matt. x., John x.) And after his resurrection he gave them commandment to preach, and likewise what they should preach: "Go ye to all the world and preach the Gospel, which I have taught you, to every creature," (Matt. xxviii., Mark xvi.) The which doctrine Luke thus expoundeth: "That repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem," (Luke xxiv.) "In his name," that is to say, "in the knowledge and faith of his merits, they should preach repent-

ance and remission of sin unto all the world : as they did most sincerely and plainly, without all glosses or additions of their own invention, and were as testimonies of the truth, and not the authors thereof," (Acts i., John i.)

So doth Paul teach, with gravity and manifest words, what is to be judged of himself and all other ministers : "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them ; and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation. Now, then, we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us ; we pray you, in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God," (2 Cor. v.) Always in their doctrine they taught the thing that Christ first taught, and God's Holy Spirit inspired them, (Gal. i. 3 ; 2 Cor. iii.) Holy apostles never took upon them to be Christ's vicar in the earth, nor to be his lieutenant ; but said, "Let a man so account of us as of the ministers of Christ and stewards of the mysteries of God," (1 Cor. iv.) In the same epistle he bindeth the Corinthians to follow him in nothing but where he followed Christ, (chap. xi.) "Be ye followers of me, even as I also am of Christ." They ministered not in the Church as though Christ were absent, although his most glorious body was departed corporeally into the heavens above ; but as Christ present, that always governed his Church with his Spirit of truth, as he promised (Matt. xxviii.): "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world."

In the absence of his body he hath commanded the protection and governance of his Church unto the Holy Ghost, the same God, and one God with the Father and his divine nature ; whose divine puissance and power overmatcheth the force of the devil ; so that hell itself cannot take one of Christ's flock out of God's protection, (John x.) And this defence dureth not for a day, nor year, but shall demour (remain) for ever, till this Church be glorified at the resurrection of the flesh, (John xv.)

It was no little pain that Christ suffered in washing away the sins of this Church ; therefore he will not commit the defence thereof unto man. It is no less glory to defend and keep the thing won by force, than it is by force to obtain the victory. Adam, Abraham, Moses, or Aaron, could not win this Church out of the devil's tyranny ; no more can they defend it when delivered. For although, by imputation of Christ's justice, those men, and all other faithful ones, be delivered from the tyranny of the devil and condemnation of the law, yet had, and hath, the devil his very friends dwelling within the corrupt nature of man as long as he liveth. The concupiscence and rebellion of man's nature ceaseth not day or night to betray man again to the devil, except, with the motion of true penitence,

this concupiscence be kept under in fear and faith ; which two virtues are so infirm in man, that be he never so perfect, yet falleth he from God sometime ; as Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, and Aaron, (Isaiah xliii., Num. xix.) Therefore he keepeth the defence and governance of the Church only and solely himself, in whom the devil hath not a jot of right. Though the apostles were instructed in all truth, and left the same written unto his Church, yet were they ministers, servants, testimonies, and preachers, of this verity, and not Christ's vicars in earth, and lieutenants to keep the keys of heaven, hell, and purgatory ; but only appointed to approve the thing to be good that God's laws commanded, and that to be ill that the word of God condemned.

Seeing that Christ doth govern his Church always by his Holy Spirit, and bindeth all the ministers thereof unto the sole word of God, what abomination is this, that any bishop of Rome, Jerusalem, Antioch, or elsewhere, should claim to be Christ's vicar in earth, and take upon him to make any laws in the Church of God, to bind the consciences of man, beside the word of God ; and, in placing of their superstition and idolatry, put the word of God out of his place ! By what law, by whom, or where, hath any this title given unto him, to be God's vicar and lieutenant upon earth ?

Moses, the best prince that ever was, and most godly governor of the people ; Aaron, that faithful high priest and preacher of God's word, never usurped this title, to be as a second Christ and master over men's consciences. If godly Moses and his brother Aaron never claimed this title in the earth, doubtless it is a foul and detestable arrogance that these ungodly bishops of Rome attribute unto themselves to be the heads of Christ's Church, and the more it is to be lamented. He that considereth their life, and conferreth it with the Scripture, will judge by the authority thereof that they were not for these many years worthy to be accounted any members of God's Church, but the members of the devil, and the first begotten of antichrist.

This is true—the see of Rome is not only a tyranny and pestilence of body and soul, but the nest of all abomination. God give him grace, and all his successors, to leave their abomination, and to come unto the light of God's word ! This beast is preached unto the people to be a man that cannot err ; his authority to be above God and his laws ; and to be the prince upon the earth of all princes. But God will judge him, as he is a murderer of both body and soul, and punish the princes of the world that uphold his abomination.

Moses and Aaron, by the testimony of the Scripture, never taught but that which they received of God, and at the last they both offended (Num. xx.); insomuch that God gave sentence against them, that neither of them should enter into the land of promise for their arrogance and pride. The text saith, "Because ye were unfaithful unto me." This false belief was not of any doubt they had in the power of God; for the miracle was done as God said; but that they attributed too much unto their own power, and said, "Hear now, ye rebels; must *we* fetch you water out of this rock?" For the changing of the *third* person in this sentence into the *first*, the ire of God pronounced sentence of death against these two very godly ministers of his word. They sinned, because they said not, "Hear, ye rebellious; cannot Jehovah, the Omnipotent, give you water out of this stone?" And is this first begotten of antichrist, the Bishop of Rome, without sin, that changeth not only the person in a sentence, but the whole sentence; yea, the whole law of God and of man? So that he reigneth in the conscience above the law of God, and will save him that God hath damned, and damn him that God hath saved; yet this person and man of sin cannot err!

But He that spared not to kill good Moses and Aaron for the abuse of the word of God, will not favour this wicked man, nor any of his *holy* doctors, at the terrible day of judgment.

Nahum the prophet doth give God a wonderful name, which the Latin and Greek cannot properly express without circumlocution, as if he retained a remembrance of injuries, and reserved the occasion of vengeance. He is the God that writeth all these blasphemies in his book of remembrance; and, when he hath shewed his mercy sufficiently, he revengeth the evil that man thinketh is forgotten. It is of his superabundant mercy that he throweth not suddenly fire upon the world of sin; and not that he is asleep, or cannot do it. Right well judged Valerius Maximus, better than now the most part of Christian men: "The divine wrath proceedeth with slow pace to its vengeance; but it will make up for its slowness by the weight of punishment."

Because God hath given this light unto my countrymen, which be all persuaded, or else God send them to be persuaded, that the Bishop of Rome, nor any other, is Christ's vicar upon earth; it is no need to use any long or copious oration; it is so plain, that it needeth no probation: the very properties of antichrist—I mean of Christ's great and principal enemy—are so openly known to all men, that are not blinded with the smoke of Rome, that they know him to be the beast that John describeth

in the Apocalypse, as well as the logician knoweth that "man is distinguished from other animal by the faculty of laughter."

This knowledge of Christ's supremacy and continual presence in the Church admitteth no lieutenant nor general vicar. Likewise it admitteth not the decrees and laws of men, brought into the Church *contrary* unto the word and Scripture of God, which is only sufficient to teach all verity and truth for the salvation of man; as it shall appear in this chapter following.

CHAPTER IV.

Of the Authority of the Word of God.

Christ, the only light of the world, sent from his Father, and born mortal man, according unto the Scripture, began to teach the word of God purely and sincerely unto the world, and chose ministers and apostles convenient for the expedition thereof; and, approved to be the very Messias by God the Father (Matt. iii. 17, John v.), taught his disciples the truth by the only law wrote by Moses and the prophets, and not by unwritten verities. And in all controversies and doubtful questions he answered his contrariants by the word of God. In that wonderful temptation of the devil (Matt. iv.), by collation of the places of Scripture he killed the devil with his own sword, falsely and in a wrong sense alleging the word of God, by the word of God godly applied.

When his disciples were reprehended by the Pharisees as breakers of the Sabbath (Matt. xii.), he excused their fact by the law: "Have ye not read what David did, and those which were with him?" So, likewise (Matt. xv. 19), in all controversies he made the law judge between his enemies and him. When he was desired to teach a young man the way to heaven, and to come to everlasting life, he said, "What is written in the law? How readest thou?" (Matt. xxii.)

Likewise the Sadducees, that denied the resurrection of the dead: "Ye err (said he), not knowing the Scriptures and the word of God." The rich man in hell, that was so desirous that his brothers living in the earth might have knowledge and warning to beware that they were not damned in time to come, would gladly have warned them himself, for a more surety (Luke xvi.) that the message should be done. Abraham answered, "They have Moses and the prophets, let them hear them." The Scripture teacheth what heaven, hell, and what man is, and what Christ is; therefore Christ sendeth us thither. (John v.) "Search the Scriptures," said he.

Again, being required in a civil manner concerning tribute

and obedience unto the princes of the world, (Matt. xxii.) he said, "Give unto the emperor that that is due unto the emperor, and unto God that that is due unto God." And under the name of the emperor he understandeth all superior powers appointed over the people by God, and would us to give due honour unto them both; as Paul teacheth, (Rom. xiii.; 1 Pet. ii.)

This law teacheth man sufficiently, as well what he is bound to do unto God as unto the princes of the world. Nothing can be desired necessary for man, but in this law it is prescribed; of what degree, vocation, or calling soever he be, his duty is shewed unto him in the Scripture. And in this it differeth from man's laws, because it is absolute, perfect, and never to be changed; nothing to be added unto it, nor taken from it. And the Church of Christ, the more it was and is burdened with man's laws, the farther it is from the true and sincere verity of God's word. The more man presumeth and taketh authority to interpret the Scripture after his own brain and subtle wit, and not as the verity of the text requireth, the more he dishonoureth the Scripture and blasphemeth God, the author thereof.

It is the office of a good man to teach the Church, as Christ taught, to revoke all errors, and bring back such as err unto the fold of Christ only by the word of Christ. For the water at the fountain-head is more wholesome and pure than when it is carried abroad in rotten pipes or stinking dishes. I had rather follow the shadow of Christ, than the body of all the general councils or doctors since the death of Christ. The devil never slept, but always by his ministers attempted to destroy the verity of Christ's religion, and clean to put out the light of truth, which was perfect in Christ's time and in the time of the apostles: none since that time so pure. St. Jerome, *in vita Malchi*, saith, that his time was darkness in the respect of the apostles' time.

The antiquity of the world doth darken the verity of God's word; as Varro saith the truth, that "age corrupteth and taketh away many things;" and "the third century doth not see the same men which the first saw." The truth of God's verity, the more it is used, practised, and taught, after the wisdom of man, the more is the glory and perfection thereof darkened. It is the contrary in all human arts; as Cicero saith: "In human discoveries nothing is invented and perfected all at once, but is improved by use and practice: so that the arts of every kind are the more advanced in excellence the farther they are removed from their first origin and inventors."

* The Church of God must therefore be bound to no other authority than unto the voice of the Gospel and unto the ministry thereof; as Isaiah saith (chap. viii.): "Seal the law among my disciples." The prophet speaketh of such darkness as should follow his time, concerning the coming of Messias, the true Doctor of the Church. Therefore he prayed to preserve the true heirs of the prophets, and that it would please him to confirm the doctrine of truth in their hearts, lest the word and true understanding of the word by the devil should be put out.

Paul would have no man to give faith to any person or minister in the Church of God, but when he preacheth the word of God truly, (Gal. i.) Men may have the gift of God to understand and interpret the Scripture unto others, but never authority to interpret it otherwise than it interpreteth itself, which the godly mind of man, by study, meditation, and conferring of one place thereof with the other, may find; howbeit, some more, some less, as God giveth his grace. For the punishment of our sins, God leaveth in all men a great imperfection; and such as were endued with excellent wit and learning saw not always the truth. As it is to be seen in Basilus, Ambrose, Epiphanius, Austin, Bernard, and others, though they stayed themselves in the knowledge of Christ, and erred not in any principal article of the faith; yet they did inordinately and more than enough extol the doctrine and tradition of men; and after the death of the apostles, every doctor's time was subject unto such ceremony and man's decrees as were neither profitable or necessary. Therefore diligently exhorted Paul the Church of Christ principally to consider and regard the foundation of all verity; meaning that doctors of the Church had their imperfections and faults. "Other foundation (saith he) can no man lay besides that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ." In these few words is established all our faith, and all false religion reprehended.

Upon this foundation some men build gold—that is to say, godly and necessary doctrine. As Polycarp, that confuted the heresy of Marcion, "on the being of God;" of the causes of sin, that the devil and man is the cause of sin, and not God or fatal destiny, nor the influence or respects of the planets. He maintained the true religion of God, and governed the Church as the Scripture taught, which he learned of John the Evan-

* It must be borne in mind that Bishop Hooper is no authority when speaking on points of discipline; but it would seem that in the sentence above, he can hardly be adduced as favouring the modern principle of private interpretation.

gelist, and defended this truth with wonderful constancy and martyrdom.

Basil and many others retained the articles of the faith, but they instituted the life and rule of monks, and preferred that kind of life before the life of such as govern in the commonwealth the people of God, and persuaded men that such kind of life was a very divine and acceptable honouring of God.

After him followed such as augmented this evil, and said, it was not only acceptable unto God, but also that men might deserve therewith remission of sin.

Thus a little and a little the devil augmented superstition, and diminished the truth of God's glory; so that we see nowhere the Church of Christ as it was in the apostles' time. Though many and godly verities have been brought unto light in our time by men of divers graces, yet is not the truth of necessary verities plainly shewed by them. Lest man should too much glory in himself, He permitted them to err in certain points; as Luther, of blessed memory, who wrote and preached the Gospel of justification, no man better; yet in the cause of the sacrament he erreth concerning the corporal presence of Christ's natural body, that there is no man can err more. I shall have occasion to write the truth concerning this matter hereafter. It is no reproach of the dead man, but mine opinion unto all the world, that the Scripture solely and the apostles' Church is to be followed, and no man's authority, be he Austin, Tertullian, or either cherubim or seraphim.

Unto the rules and canons of the Scripture must man trust, and reform his errors thereby, or else he shall not reform himself, but rather deform his conscience. The Church of the Romans, Corinthians, and others, the seven Churches that John writeth of in the Apocalypse, were in all things reformed unto the rule and form prescribed by the everlasting God. The image of these Churches I always print in my mind; and where-soever I come I look how near they resemble those afore rehearsed, and whether their preachers preach simply without dispensation of any part of God's most necessary word; and whether all the occasions of idolatry be taken away, as images, which Gregory calleth the books of the laymen, though this title be against the second commandment, and never approved by the Old Testament nor the New, by word or example.

Where the occasion is not removed, the word of God must needs stand in hazard; for God will not (say the wisdom of man what it list) have his Church pestered with any kind of idolatry; and to make God and the devil agree in one Church it is impossible. St. John hath wonderful words in the Apoca-

lypse (chap. iii.) unto the Church of the Laodiceans: "I know thy works, that thou art neither cold nor hot; I would thou wert cold or hot. So, then, because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spew thee out of my mouth." These words are very necessary to be borne in mind; for he that is neither hot nor cold, but indifferent to use the knowledge of God's word and Christ's Church with the word and gloss of man, and that teacheth the use of images in the Church, before he can prove by the authority of God's word that they may be suffered in the Church, doth not well. They have been the occasion of great hurt and idolatry. The Church of the Old Testament or the New never taught the people with images.

Therefore it shall be the office of every man that loveth God and his word to follow the Scripture only, and to bewail the ignorance of such as have, before our time, or now in our time, by words or writing, defended the same; and with all humility and humbleness submit himself to the judgment and censure of the judge of all judges, the word of God, that he may wisely and godly discern what is to be believed and accepted of any doctor's writings, and what is not to be accepted; what is to be pardoned, and what is not to be pardoned; and by the perils and dangers of others learn to be wise, that we commit not the same fault.

A fine gloss and free interpretation cannot make good an ill thing. If I should say an image provoketh devotion, holy water teacheth that the blood of Christ was sprinkled for my sins, the holy bread teacheth that Christ's body was torn for my sins, what shall these glosses excuse the fact? Nay, nay, Christ, that died for our sakes, would not his death to be preached this way, but out of the Scripture by the tongue of man, and not out of the decrees of bishops by a drop of water or a painted post. He, that took the pains to die and suffer his passion for the redemption of the world solely and only, solely and only hath taken the pains to teach the world how and which way they should keep this passion in mind, and left it unto the world in writing by the hands of his holy apostles: unto the which writing only he hath bound and obliged his Church, and not to the writings of men.

In this passage I admonish the Christian reader that I speak not of the laws of magistrates or princes, that daily ordain new laws for the preservation of their commonwealth, as they see the necessity of their realms or cities requires; but of such laws as men have ordained for the Church of Christ, which should be now and for ever governed by the word of God. In this case, like as Eve offended, obeying the persuasion of the

devil, contrary unto the commandment of God ; so doth every man offend, obeying any laws or decrees that command any thing contrary unto the word of God. This law must prevail, “We must obey God rather than man.” The example hereof we have in Daniel, of the three children, who chose rather to burn in the fiery furnace than to worship the image that Nebuchadnezzar had made. So did the apostles, (Acts v.)

Let all the world consider whether such laws of the bishops as the mass, which is a profanation of Christ’s supper to bind men’s consciences to pray unto dead saints ; to say that images are to be suffered in the temples ; and to constrain the ministers of the Church to live sole, contrary to their vocation ; are to be obeyed or not. They do no less offend God in obeying these laws, than Eve did in obeying the voice of the serpent. The wisdom of all the wits in the world cannot comprehend the greatness of this ill. Make what laws they will for the body, so they leave the conscience free, with patience it is to be suffered ; only I lament the bondage of the conscience. Cursed be those that make such laws, and cursed be those that with sophistry defend them. That parasite and bondman of the Bishop of Rome, Pighius, in his writings, shameth not to say, “It is less sin for a priest to keep another man’s wife, than to have a wife of his own.”

Concerning acts indifferent, which of themselves are neither good nor ill—as, to refrain from eating of flesh on the Friday, observing of the feasts kept holy in the remembrance of such holy martyrs as died for the faith of Christ, or in keeping holy Easter and Whit-Sunday—there are two respects most diligently to be observed : the one good, and to be suffered ; the other ill, and to be eschewed. Such as abstain from flesh, and think they do better service to God, and would likewise obtain remission of their sins by those works, do declare both themselves and their works to be ill. But such as abstain because the spirit may be more ardent, and the mind more given to study and prayer, do well, and as they be bound to do. And they who come into the temple to pray for themselves and the Church of Christ, and to hear the word of God, do well. For as God commandeth his word to be preached and heard, so he hath appointed a certain time, as the Sabbath, when people should hear it. And not only is this order to be observed in the Church, but also in every family and household, of what degree soever they be. Each should cause his family and children to read some part of the Bible for their erudition, to know God. Likewise he should constrain them to pray unto God for the promotion of his holy word and for the preservation of the

governors of the commonwealth, so that no day should pass without prayer and augmentation of knowledge in the religion of Christ.

But our new evangelists have another opinion: they dream of faith that justifieth, the which neither repentance precedeth, neither honesty of life followeth, which shall be to their double damnation, if they amend not. He that will conform his knowledge unto the word of God, let him likewise convert his life withal, as the word requireth, and as all the examples of Christ and his Gospel teach; or else what will he do with the doctrine of Christ, which only teacheth, and sufficiently teacheth, all verity and virtuous life? Let him tarry still in the doctrine of man, and live as manly and as carnally as he list, and not profess to know God and his truth, rather than so to slander them both. This sufficeth to prove the only word of God to be sufficient to teach the truth. All other men's laws be neither necessary nor profitable; and certain we be that the Church of the apostles did want those decrees that Papistry of late days hath endowed the Church withal.

CHAPTER V.

Of the Intercession of Christ.

The second office of Christ is to pray and to make intercession for his people. This office John writeth of in his first epistle: "If any man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ, that maketh intercession for us." And as Paul saith: "Christ, who was dead, yea, who is also raised again, who is even at the right hand of God: who also intercedeth for us." In his name, and in the belief and confidence of his merits, we may obtain the mercies of God and life everlasting, as Paul saith: "Let us draw nigh to the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need." This intercession of Christ only sufficeth. No man should seek any other Mediator of intercession or expiation of sin, as Paul saith, declaring the sufficiency and ability of Christ's death and intercession: "Christ remaineth for ever, having a perpetual priesthood: wherefore he is able to save to the uttermost those who come to God by him; being alway living to this end, that he may intercede for them."

Unto this intercession and prayer in Christ's name he bound his Church by express commandment: "Ask, and it shall be given you." And in the same place he sheweth the cause wherefore it shall be given: "Whatsoever ye ask in the belief and confidence of my merits, it shall be given unto you." St.

Paul calleth Christ, sitting at the right hand of God, the minister and servant of the saints; that is to say, of such as be here living in this troubled and persecuted Church, to solicit and do all their affairs, as a faithful ambassador with the Father of heaven, until the consummation of the world.

This doctrine of Christ's intercession must be always diligently preached unto the people; and likewise that in all necessities, calamities, and trouble, the afflicted person must seek none other means to offer his prayers unto God, but Christ only, according as the Scripture teacheth, and as we have example of holy saints in the same. Not only in the New Testament, where he commandeth us to pray in his name, and Stephen in his martyrdom commended his spirit unto this only Mediator, saying, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit;" but also in the Old Testament thus prayed the patriarchs and prophets. Jacob (Gen. xlviii.): "God, and the angel who delivered me from all evil, bless these lads." And David (Psa. lxxi.): "And they shall worship him alway." Forasmuch as Christ is daily in heaven, and prayeth for his Church, the Church of Christ must pray, as Christ hath taught it; as the patriarchs, prophets, and the apostles have given us example, who never prayed unto dead saints; yea, as Christ hath given us example hanging on the cross, saying, "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit."

What intolerable ill blasphemy of God and ethnical idolatry is this, to admit and teach the invocation of saints departed out of this world! It taketh from God his true honour; it maketh him as nothing, that only hath ordained Christ to be Mediator between man and him. It diminisheth the merits of Christ, taketh from the law of God her perfection and majesty; whereas God hath opened his will and pleasure unto the world in all things. It condemneth the old Church of the patriarchs and prophets, likewise the Church of the apostles and martyrs, who never thought of the invocation of saints. It accuseth the Scripture of God to be false, which saith, "Thou shalt neither add nor diminish anything." It maketh Christ a liar, who said, "The Spirit, whom I will send from the Father, he shall teach you all truth." If the men that teach, "Holy Mary, pray for us," be more holy than all the patriarchs or prophets and apostles, let the conscience of the Christian reader judge.

This distinction of mediators, to be one of expiation for sin, Christ, and another of intercession, the saints departed, is nought; it repugneth the manifest text of Scripture. It is the office only of Christ to be the Mediator for sin, and likewise to offer the prayers of the Church to his Father, (John i.):

“Behold the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sins of the world.” As concerning intercession, he commandeth us only to ask in his name, and prescribed the manner how to ask, and what to ask, (Luke xi.)

As for such as say, “If the saints that we pray unto hear us not, nor profit a deal, yet it hindereth not, we lose but our labour;” thus much it hindereth, it declareth him that prayeth to be an infidel. To pray unto that god or goddess who is not able to help him, nor hear his prayers, is to be no better than he that prayeth unto the image of Jupiter in Crete, that had neither ears nor eyes. It declareth him to condemn both God and his word, who assureth every man, in every time and in every distress, not only to hear him, but also to give aid, (Matt. xi.) So now this worshipper of saints departeth from the known and Almighty God to an unknown god, and preferreth the doctrine of man and the devil before the Scripture of truth and the living God. I hope this detestable error is come to light, and all men taught to pray as the Scripture canonical teacheth.

But there is another ill as great as this, to be reprehended of all such as know how to pray aright—the being of images in the temple, which the world saith may be suffered in the churches, and saith they be good to put the people of God in remembrance of such godly saints as died for Christ’s sake. But this is always the subtilty of the devil, when a manifest ill cannot be borne withal, to seek a gloss and interpretation, that where he cannot walk in the Church openly like a devil, and have candles stuck before a post and the images kissed, yet to desire some man to put a fair coat upon his back, that he may have a place in the Church to lurk in, until such time as occasion be ministered to shew himself again as he is. The authority of God’s word requireth me to pronounce this true judgment in the cause of images, that they be not worshipped in the Church, that their presence in the Church is against God’s word, as well as to say, “Holy Mary, pray for us.” And as the one is to be eschewed and banished out of the heart, so is the other out of the eye in the temple, where God’s word is preached unto the people and the sacraments ministered.

This I prove by the authority of both Testaments, the Old and the New. The Old saith, “Thou shalt make no image,” (Exod. xx.; Deut. vi.) In the New there is no mention made of any image, but that Christ, concerning the law and precepts of the commandments, said, “I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil the law,” (Matt. v.) Forasmuch as Christ left the commandments of the old law unto the Church, in the which he saith, “Thou shalt not make any image,” from whence

have these men authority that say, if any images be not honoured they may be suffered in the Church? It is but their opinion, contrary and beside the law of God. And this commandment, "Thou shalt not make"—"thou shalt not worship," forbiddeth as well the making of the image as the honouring of it. Concerning the having of them in the place of public prayer and in the use of the sacraments, such as would have this occasion of idolatry to remain in the Church would pass over this second commandment, which saith, "Thou shalt not make to thyself any graven image; thou shalt not worship it;" and make of the tenth commandment two commandments. But the text will not suffer it. For as the Lord there forbiddeth the inward lust and concupiscence of his neighbour's house, so doth he forbid the lust and concupiscence of his neighbour's wife, servant, or daughter; and all is but one commandment, (Exod. xx.) Read the text in the Hebrew, and then it shall be more plain.

The second commandment, which the defenders of images neglect, forbiddeth not only the outward reverence and honour, but also by the same express commandment forbiddeth to *make* any image. They do injury to the manifest text, and their gloss is to be abhorred, and the plain text to be followed.

The king's majesty that is dead willed not only all his true subjects to have no familiarity with Cardinal Poole, but also to refrain his company, and not to have to do with him in any case, and not without good and necessary consideration. He that would (notwithstanding the command of the king's majesty) have haunted Poole's company, and at the time of his accusation have said he was not with Poole for friendship nor familiarity to do him any honour, but haunted his company with such other persons as meant no ill to the king's majesty or his realm, doubtless this law should of right and equity condemn him (neither for friendship, neither other cause, any man should use his company). Doubtless, as the king's majesty, and every other prince, knoweth it to be dangerous daily to suffer his subjects to be in the company of his traitorous enemies; so God knew right well what danger it was to suffer man, his creature, to have company with those idols, and therefore said, "Thou shalt neither worship them nor make them." All the princes of the earth have not had so many subjects betrayed and made traitors by their enemies, as God hath lost souls by the means of images. I make all the world judge that know the truth.

It is so childish an opinion to say that images may be suffered in the Church so they be not honoured, that it needeth no probation at all. The Gentiles, whom St. Paul speaketh of

(Rom. i.), knew right well that the idol was not God; and all the idolators that used images, that the New Testament speaketh of (1 Cor. v. and x.; 1 Pet. iv.; 1 John v.), knew right well that those images of gold or silver were not the devil that they worshipped. The apostles condemned not only their false religion, but also their images. John, by express words, calleth the image idolatry, and biddeth them beware of images, saying, "Keep yourselves from images." David (Psa. cxv.) saith, "The idols of the Gentiles are silver and gold." He condemneth not only their false religion, but also the images made by the hand of man, which were of gold and silver. Their false god was neither gold, neither silver, but a wicked spirit, who had entered for lack of faith into their spirits.

It is to be lamented that God for our sins thus suffereth the world to be deluded by the devil. Of late years the images were in the temple, and honoured with *Paternoster*, heart and mind, with leg and knee. This use of images is taken away in many places, but now they be applied to another use, namely, to teach the people and to be the laymen's books. As Damascene and many others say, "Oh! blasphemous and devilish doctrine, to appoint the most noble creature of God, man, endued with wit and reason resembling the image of the everlasting God, to be instructed and taught of a mute, dumb, blind, and dead idol! The brute beast that goeth by the way, and the ass that serveth for the mill, is not taught by the rod of the carter, but by the prudence of him that useth the rod; and should those painted blocks be the books of reasonable man?" Full well can the devil transform himself into an angel of light, and deceive the people under the pretence of true religion. I had rather trust to the shadow of the Church that the Scripture teacheth, than to all the men's writings since the death of Polycarp.

Christ saith not, "Go preach unto the people by images;" but said, "Go into all the world and preach the Gospel," (Matt. xxviii.) They say that images adorn and seemly deck the temple of God; whereas the people resort to hear the word of God: so the more images the more dishonoured is the temple. First let them teach, by the manifest word of God, that the temple should be decked with such idols as cannot teach nor speak. Some man's tongue must declare the history of the idol, or else they know not what the idol is; peradventure take St. Barbara for St. Catherine, and St. Concumbre for the rood of Paul; Balaam and his ass, that for lucre attempted to curse the Church of God, for Christ and his ass, that came to bless and sanctify his Church with his precious blood. It is

the abuse and profanation of the temple to suffer them, and a great occasion for people to return to their accustomed ill. I would all men should indifferently ponder these reasons, and judge whether they be to be suffered or not.

First, the most perfect Churches of the prophets, Christ, and his apostles, used no such means to instruct the people. We ought to follow them and the word of God written by the prophets and apostles. Also the Greek Church never consented willingly to admit the use of images in the temples. The ill that hath happened unto the people by the means of images is too plain and well known—God by idolatry robbed of his glory, and the idolator disinherited of God's mercy, except he repent in this life. An image once brought into the Church liveth a long time. Grant that at the beginning there was a good preacher in the Church; the preacher dieth; the idol the longer it liveth the younger it waxeth, as ye may see by the idols of Walsingham, Canterbury, and Hales. They flourished most a little before the desolation, in the reign of the king's majesty that is dead, Henry VIII. of a blessed memory. At their setting up I suppose the preachers were more diligent and zealous of God's glory than afterward. But was not the original damnable against the word of God, to give the people such a book to learn by that should school them to the devil?

The words of Gregory to Serenus, Bishop of the Massilians, should move no man, though he say, "What the Scripture is to those that read, the same does the picture afford to the eyes of those who cannot:" and doth reprehend Serenus for the breaking of images, saying the like was not seen done by any other minister. This is but St. Gregory's opinion. Epiphanius, writing in a certain epistle to John, Bishop of Jerusalem, willeth the occasion of ill to be taken out of the Church, as Paul commandeth, (1 Thess. v.) This doctor, as all men know, was of singular learning and virtue.

Again, against the authority of Gregory the Great, I set the authority of Athanasius the Great, who denieth, by express words, the images to be the books of the lay people. With great gravity and godly reasons this great clerk confuteth this fond opinion—images to be the books of the laymen.

The great clerk Lactantius crieth so out against images, that he saith there can be no true religion where they be. Tertullian, "*De Corona Militis*," judgeth the same. The law of God doth not only condemn the use of them in the Church, and these holy doctors, but also the name of an image declareth it to be an abomination.

Read all the Scripture, and in every place where thou findest

this word, *ezeb*, idol or image, it signifies either affliction, rebellion, sorrow, sadness, travail, or pain, or else that wicked *muk* and mammon of the world, or the thing that always provoketh the ire of God, as Rabbi David Kymchi well expoundeth Psalm cxv. This Jew saith that the idols bring men into hatred of God, expounding these words of David, "Like unto them are all they that put their trust in them:" he saith the text must be understood by the manner of prayer, as though David prayed Almighty God to make these gravers and carvers of images as dumb, as blind, as mute, and as insensible as the idol, that can neither speak nor hear.

What should move men to defend in the Church of Christ so unnecessary an ill and pestilent treasure, that hath seduced both our fathers and great-grandfathers? whereas the Church of the patriarchs, prophets, and apostles never used them, but in all their writings abhorred them. Loved we God, we would be content with Scripture. Every scholar of Aristotle taketh this for a sufficient verity, "The master saith so:" he will be contented as soon as he heareth his master's name. Cicero (lib. iii. De Oratore) was thus persuaded of those that were excellent orators, "and so esteems the suavity of Isocrates, the subtlety of Lysius, the acumen of Hyperides, the eloquence of Æschines, the power of Demosthenes, and the oratory of Catullus, that whatsoever, saith he, you add, or change, or take away, it will become thereby worse." And should not the patriarchs, prophets, Christ, and the apostles, as well suffice the Church of God?

What although many learned men have approved of images, should their wisdom maintain anything contrary unto the word of God? No; a Christian man must not care who speaketh, but what is spoken; the truth is to be accepted, whosoever speaketh it. Balaam was as wise, learned, and replenished with God's gift, as man could be; notwithstanding, his ass telling the truth must be believed better than he. The law of God teacheth no use of images, but saith, "Thou shalt not make, thou shalt not worship it" (Exod. xx.): believe it. Yet the art of graving and painting is the gift of God. To have the picture or image of any martyr or others, so they be not put in the temple of God, nor otherwise abused, it may be suffered. Christ, by the picture of Cæsar, taught his audience obedience unto the civil prince, saying, *Cujus est hæc imago? Cæsaris inquit.* Ergo reddite quæ sunt Cæsaris Cæsari: "Whose image is this? They say to him, Cæsar's. Therefore render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's."

But if man will learn to know God by his creatures, let him

not say, "Good morrow, master," to an old moth-eaten post, but behold the heavens, which declare the mighty power of God. Consider the earth, how it bringeth forth the fruits thereof, the water with fishes, the air with the birds. Consider the disposition, order, and amity that is between the members of man's body, the one always ready to help the other and to save the other—the hand the head, the head the foot, the stomach to disperse the meat and drink into the external parts of the body. Yea, let man consider the hawk and the hound, that obey in their vocation, and so every other creature of the earth, and with true heart and unfeigned penitence come to the knowledge of himself, and say, "All the creatures that ever the living God made, obey in their vocation, saving the devil, and I, most wretched man."

Those things were made to be testimonies unto us of God's mighty power, and to draw men unto virtue—not these idols which the devil caused to be set in the temple, to bring men from God. Thus did Christ teach the people his most blessed death and passion, and the fruit of his passion by the grain of corn cast into the earth. He hanged not the picture of his body upon the cross, to teach them his death, as our late learned men have done.

The ploughman, be he never so unlearned, shall better be instructed of Christ's death and passion by the corn that he soweth in the field, and likewise of Christ's resurrection, than by all the dead posts that hang in the Church or are pulled out of the supulchre with "Christ is risen." What resemblance hath the taking of the cross out of the sepulchre and going a procession with it, with the resurrection of Christ? None at all; the dead post is as dead when they sing "Now he is not dead," as it was when they buried it with "His grave is made in peace." If any preacher would manifest the resurrection of Christ unto the senses, why doth not he teach them by the grain of the field that is risen out of the earth, and cometh of the dead corn that he sowed in the winter? Why doth not the preacher preach the death and resurrection of Christ by such figures and metaphors as the Scripture teacheth? Paul wonderfully (1 Cor. xv.) proveth with arguments the death and resurrection of Christ, and ours likewise, that nothing may be more plainly taught.

A dead post carried in procession as much resembleth the resurrection of Christ, as very death resembleth life. People should not be taught either by images or by relics, as Erasmus, in his third book of Ecclesiastes, well declareth. Lactantius useth a wonderful, divine, eloquent, and plain manner in the

declaring of this resurrection, which is sung yearly in the Church concerning Easter Day, with many godly and divine verses. The same Lactantius saith that there can be no true religion where these images be. Austin ad Marcellum reprehendeth them wonderfully in these words of David, "Mouths have they, and speak not;" and saith men may be soon deceived by images. Likewise in the first book "De Consensu Evangelistarum."

Such as defend them have nothing but sophistical arguments to blind the people with. The Scripture and the apostles' Church used none. As for Gregory the Great and Theodosius, with others that defend them, all the histories declare that men of greater learning than they by the Scripture condemned them: as Leo III., the Emperor Constantinus V., who assembled all the learned men of Asia and Greece, and condemned the use of images, that Gregory and Martin I. had established. But it forceth not, had all Asia, Africa, and Europe, and Gabriel the archangel descended from heaven, and approved the use of images. Forasmuch as the apostles neither taught nor wrote of them, their authority should have no place. The word of God solely and only is to be preferred (Gal. i.), which forbiddeth images.

CHAPTER VI.

The third Office of Christ is concerning his Priesthood, to offer Sacrifice unto God, and by the same to purge the World from Sin.

Paul (Phil. ii.) saith that Christ "humbled himself unto the death of the cross." (Heb. ii.): "He was made partaker of man's mortal nature, that by death he might destroy him that had the empire and dominion of death, that is to say the devil." John calleth him "the Lamb that doth take away the sin of the world," (John i.) All the sacrifices of the old law were figures and types of this only sacrifice, which was appointed by God to die and to suffer the ire and displeasure of God for the sin of man, as though he himself were a sinner and had merited this displeasure. The greatness of this ire, sorrow, confusion, ignominy, and contempt, neither angel nor man can express: his pains were so intolerable and his passion so dolorous, his deity so obedient with the Father's will, that it was not only a sacrifice, but also a just recompense to satisfy for all the world solely and only, as Christ taught Nicodemus, John iii.; as Paul, Heb. vii. viii. ix. x.; Isa. liii., and so all the prophets and patriarchs. And such a sacrifice as once for all sufficeth, (Heb. vii.)

These two offices of Christ should never be out of remembrance. They declare the infinite mercy of God, and likewise his indifferent and equal justice unto all creatures, without respect of persons. The token of his mercy may be known in this—that he would not that all mankind should be lost, though in Adam all deserved eternal death. He opened his mercy unto Adam, not only by word, but also by the fire that descended upon his sacrifices and his son's. So to Abraham; then to the world, by the incarnation and death of his only Son, and the promise of grace, and the promise of everlasting life, unto such as repent and believe in him.

The sign of his ire and displeasure unto man is this—that he would not accept man again into his favour for any penance, any sorrow, any trouble, any adversity, any weeping, any wailing, nor for the death of any person, until his own Son, most dear beloved, by death appeased his displeasure, and became surety to satisfy the justice of God, and the right that the devil had unto all mankind. This if man remembered as deeply and as earnestly as the matter requireth, it should make his heart full sorry, and bring him unto an honest and virtuous trade of life. It would bring him to consider this example of God's justice and equity in the appeasing of his own justly conceived ire, and likewise that he would do no wrong unto his mortal enemy the devil. Except the Son of God had been an equal and just redemption, a price correspondent to make amends and satisfy the fault and guilt of man's sin, God would not have taken one soul from the right and justice of the devil.*

* A most monstrous and dangerous doctrine is exhibited in this last paragraph, and one which Bishop Hooper would hardly have consented to, had it been proposed to him in so many words, viz., that the sin of man gives Satan not only a power but a right over his soul.

THE OLD AND THE NEW LEARNING.

BY WILLIAM TURNER, M.D.,

DEAN OF WELLS AND CONFESSOR.

THE Jews, which were blinded by the old leaven of the Scribes and Pharisees, said, "What new learning is this?" Even as the unlearned people of this realm, blinded of long time by the false doctrine and ordinances of the Bishop of Rome, do call the Gospel of Christ (long buried and holden down by man's doctrine, when it now beginneth to be preached again) new learning and strange doctrine, and that because they have not been acquainted with it, but only have been brought up in the learning of the Pharisees of our time. Was Christ's learning new learning, I pray now, because the Jews had never heard it before preached of the Pharisees? If it were no new learning, but many hundred years before preached and taught by the prophets, then is not the Gospel which we preach now new learning, because you have not heard it before, any more than the sun is a new sun to a man which hath been in a house twenty years, and never saw the sun in his life, before at the last he seeth it, and calleth it a new light.

How was it possible to see the Gospel, or to know it in all your lifetime, seeing that no man might read the Gospel himself without great jeopardy; and they that should have read and preached it, neither could preach it, neither would read it in a tongue that ye could understand? Whereby ye are come now to this ignorance, that ye judge the long hidden truth of Christ's Gospel to be a new learning, as the heathen men of Athens called Paul's doctrine a new learning, because they had never heard it before. The same thing that Christ and Paul suffered in their days do now the preachers of the true word of God suffer. For, as the Jews and the heathen men, when they could not otherwise bring Christ's learning and Paul's into despising and contempt, they accused it of *newness*, and said it was a new doctrine; so, now-a-days, the Pharisees and their followers,

when they cannot accuse the doctrine of the Gospel of falseness, they lay *newness* unto it. And as the old Pharisaical Jews, and proud heathen wise men of the world, when they had no reason nor Scripture to defend their opinions, which they held against Christ and Paul, they leaned only unto antiquity and old time, and with that weapon (*though they had it not in deed*) did ever fight against Christ and the apostles; so the Pharisees and scholars of this time, not being able to improve the word of God, call it new learning; and as their masters, for lack of Scripture, they for succour, for the maintenance of their doctrine, fly to the antiquity of the old doctors, allowing all things that they see therein, dispraising whatsoever they cannot find in them. As if Christ's doctrine were not to be received but as the doctors have received it, and so much of Christ's learning shall be put out of use as the doctors will not allow.

It is now-a-days asked, whether laymen may receive, as well as priests, both parts of the supper of the Lord? They answer, that Christ doth allow both the parts; but forasmuch as the old doctors think it meet that laymen should have but one part alone, the priests two parts, they cannot get the sacrament of Christ's holy blood. And so with many other matters, whereof I shall make mention hereafter. Is not this a pretty play, that the antiquity of doctors should weigh down the truth of God's word, and change the ordinance of Christ? Is not this to prefer antiquity before the verity, and to set man above God, and to reckon the *younger* the *older*, and to reckon the creature above the Creator?

I desire all you, that are wilfully minded to be blind, to read this book with an indifferent eye, and, when ye have read it, then judge, whether our learning or their learning, which boast themselves so much of old antiquity, is the older, and more agreeing with God's holy word. The everlasting God, which is without beginning and ending, grant us all to know his holy word, and, after we have known it, godly to live after it. Amen.

OF THE SACRAMENTS.

The new Learning.

It is enough and sufficient to receive the sacraments effectually and with fruit, to have no stop or let of deadly sin. And there is not required in a man a good motion within him, which receiveth them, whereby of a concurrence or worthiness he may deserve grace: for the sacraments bring grace with them of the work that is wrought by them, or by the work itself; that is to say, because the work is shewed and ministered as a sign or a

sacrament. This saith the master of sentences in the fourth book, in the first distinction.

Among the doctors of the same opinion are, Trigerus, Eckius, Faber, Pighius, and Billichius, with the whole rabble of Duns's disciples, and all sworn Papists. These men have written but of late, and the eldest of them wrote not above five hundred years ago.

The old Learning.

The Gospel witnesseth, that we be saved, not by an holy sign, but through faith. (Gen. xv.): "Abraham gave credence, and believed God, and that was reckoned to him for righteousness." (Rom. iv. and x.): "If a man believe from the heart, he shall be made righteous." He saith not, that with the body an holy sign is taken unto righteousness. Also (Habakkuk ii. and Rom. i.): "The just shall live by his faith." He saith not, he shall live by the sacrament. It followeth, therefore, after the old learning, that faith is necessary to be had in him that receiveth the sacrament with fruit.

The authors of this learning, that are the youngest, wrote fifteen hundred years ago: then judge, I pray thee, good reader, whether our learning, which was taught only by the prophets and apostles so many years ago, ought rather to be called *old learning*, or theirs, whose writers wrote not above five hundred years past. The authors of our learning, and setters forth of the same, were Moses, Elias, Jeremiah, Daniel, David, Solomon, Peter, Paul, John, Luke, Mark, and Matthew; and the chief author of our learning was God himself. The authors of the Papists' learning are the Popes, Gregory, Boniface, Duns, Dorbell, Thomas de Aquino, with such others of the same sort. Now judge which side hath better authors, the Papists or we.

OF PENANCE.

The new Learning.

A man's will only naturally (doing that which lieth in him) may dispose itself to the receiving of grace, by an act conformable unto right reason, the which is morally good. Also a man's will in putting away a stop or let—that is, the purpose of deadly sin, of a good motion drawn out of free will—may deserve the first grace of a congruence. (In the second book of the master of sentences, the twenty-fifth distinction).

What meaneth this learneth else, but that (as Pelagius saith) the beginning of our justification cometh of ourselves, and the end, or making perfect, cometh of God? Then might a

man, by his own strength, begin penance, which they call contrition, as though the beginning of it were in us. This learning maketh hypocrites, and maintaineth the pride of the old man.

The old Learning.

In the tenth chapter of Zechariah it is written: "I will convert them, because I will have mercy upon them." (Lam. v.): "Convert us, Lord, to thee, and we shall be converted." (John xv.): "Without me ye can do nothing." (Philip. ii.): "God worketh the will." (2 Cor. iii.): "Every good thought is of God." (Rom. xiii.): "If it be of works, then it is not of grace." (2 Timothy, iii.): "If God at any time will give them repentance," &c. Therefore, after the *old learning*, repentance is the gift of God: the which grace, that justifieth, worketh, and not the power which draweth out free will. Before the time that a man have grace, neither his thought nor his will is good; neither hath he any good work, but all is sin: for as the tree is, such is the fruit. The person is a sinner, and also flesh; then what other things can it savour, will, or work, but fleshly things? This doctrine maketh man lowly, and beateth down the pride and arrogancy of the old Adam.

OF CONFESSION.

The new Learning.

Whosoever cometh to the years of discretion, at least once in the year he is bound to confess all his sins, both open and secret, with all their circumstances, to his curate, or else he is not a Christian man. And the bishop hath authority to reserve, and keep only to himself, the forgiveness of certain sins, by the reason of their great enormity, the which a simple priest cannot absolve, but in the point of death. So do the new fellows say, as in the canon law, *cap. Omnis utriusque sexus*, &c., and the master of sentences about the seventeenth distinction.

The old Learning.

In the 31st Psalm: "I have said, I will confess against mine unrighteousness to the Lord, and thou hast forgiven me the ungodliness of my sin." Behold, the prophet doth confess himself unto the Lord, and he getteth forgiveness of all his sins. (Luke xviii.): The publican saith, "Be merciful to me, a sinner:" and he goeth home justified unto his house. Where is here any rehearsing of circumstances, and of hidden sins in the priest's ear? (Luke vii.): The sinful woman speaketh

nothing, but weepeth and falleth lowly down at the feet of Jesus, and she had by-and-by forgiveness of her sins, and he said unto her, "Depart in peace." (Matt. iii.): Jerusalem and all Judea, and all the country near the flood of Jordan, goeth forth to John, and they confess their sins, namely, in a general confession; for they granted themselves to be sinners, inasmuch as they asked baptism, a sign of repentance; yet for all that ye hear no rehearsal of sins.

We read, in the Acts, that the same thing was done at Ephesus at the preaching of the apostle: yet for all that we see in no place these words: "a peculiar or proper priest,"—"all hidden sins,"—"all circumstances," and such others.

In the first of John, the first chapter, we have a confession which is of God's law, by the which we confess our faults lowly to God, the knower of man's heart. "He is faithful and righteous to forgive us" them, for he giveth grace to lowly persons, and resisteth proud men, (1 Pet. v.) Where true penance is, truly there is also confession, as the true fruit of penance. We do *not utterly* forsake auricular or ear confession, but the additions of man's traditions are parted and sundered from wholesome doctrine as chaff is from the corn. It is a wholesome doctrine, and according to God's law, to require the law at the mouth of a priest, and to learn of the bishop the way of the Lord, (Mala. ii.; Hag. ii.; 1 Tim. iii.; Tit. i.) Therefore I would not that the order of the Church should be broken, which is (1 Cor. xii.) where the apostle, after that he had made mention of the mystical body, sheweth that Christ set in the Church or congregation, first, apostles; then prophets or preachers; thirdly, teachers.

Why should teachers be in the Church?—namely, for this intent, that they, having the fashion and the form of wholesome words, should teach the Church those things which be necessary for men's salvation, and resist, with the sword of the Spirit, the enemies of the faith, and all ungodliness; and that they might preach the word both openly and privily; that they be fervent in season and out of season; that they rebuke, reprove, and exhort, with all gentleness and learning, (2 Tim. iv.) Let them know the face and countenance of their flock; and, to be short, let them be full of those virtues, the which God requireth (Ezek. xxxiv.) of the watchmen or overseers of the house of Israel.

If we perceive not, and be ignorant in anything that pertaineth unto a Christian man's living, and is not plainly taught in the open sermon, we must go to the curate, to hear of his mouth the judgments and testimonies of the Lord. If any doubt arise in our consciences, whom ought we rather to go to

and ask counsel, than of the head man of our souls? Furthermore, when we be faint-hearted, or have no courage, and are vexed with temptations, we may not despise the remedy that God ordained. Thou hast God's word (Matt. xviii.): "Where two or three," &c. (John xx.): "Whose sins ye shall remit," &c. Whom would not these fatherly promises provoke and allure to confession, when the conscience is lifted up and established, not by man's word, but by God's word spoken by man's mouth?

But these, which follow, be man's additions, viz., to bind a man's conscience with a law, and to compel him to confess all his sins, with all their circumstances, at a certain time, to his own priest or curate, whatsoever he be. Hereby men's consciences be marked with a hot iron. For he that is not confessed, after the manner that is prescribed in the confessionals, either by the reason of ignorance, or of a frail memory, or shame-facedness (yea, though he be ashamed and repent him of his evil life with all his heart); yet for all that, as long as he liveth, he beareth about with him an unquiet conscience, and full of despair. And if a man take a little diligence, or have a good memory, or write his sins on a piece of paper, and so confess and pour out into a friar's ear, that cannot well hear all the filthiness of his unclean living, good Lord, how glad is he that not only he hath satisfied the law, but because also he hath taken off his shoulders a burden heavier than *Ætna*, the hill that always burneth. When he hath deserved forgiveness of his sins with this troublesome work, he standeth in his own conceit, which would have despaired if he had not rehearsed his sins after this manner.

Let the bishops appoint learned men to hear confessions, and not blockheads, and then the people shall come to the priests by heaps and swarms. The which thing while they do not, let them blame themselves, and not us, if the people set little by their curates.

Furthermore, as concerning the reserving and keeping behind certain causes and chances, let the head rulers in the Church tell a cause why they do differ and abhor so greatly the apostles' rites and teachings. The Scripture maketh no difference of ministers in the labour of the Gospel. When the Lord sent forth his disciples into the world, he gave them like power, saying, "Go into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature: he that shall believe and be baptized shall be saved," (Mark xvi.) In John xx. he saith unto them, "Take ye the Holy Ghost, and whatsoever sins ye forgive, they shall be forgiven." Where is here any difference in *this* matter of *forgiveness* between a bishop and a simple priest? Is it hard to know what this is to say, "Whose sins ye remit, they shall be remitted?" This is the doctrine of Christ and his apostles.

OF SATISFACTION.

The new Learning.

A certain satisfaction is to be enjoined to him that is confessed for his sins that be past, according to the quantity or quality of the sins, that he may content and satisfy the righteousness of God. This hath the seventeenth and eighteenth distinction of the fourth book of the master of sentences. By this doctrine the grace of Christ's redemption is darkened, overshadowed, and defaced, and man's works enhanced, to the most injury of Christ's passion.

The old Learning.

Isaiah the old prophet, which wrote long before Christ was born, saith, in the fifty-third chapter, "He is broken for our wickedness." The Father hath laid on his own neck all our iniquities and wickedness. "I have smitten him for the mischief of my people." Here thou mayest see that Christ did satisfaction for the sins of all the world. Also (1 Pet. ii.): "He bare our sins in his body on the cross, that we should be delivered from sin, and should live in righteousness; by whose stripes we are healed." Also in 1 Cor. i.: "Christ is our righteousness and redemption." John saith (chap. x.): "Christ spent his life for his sheep." (Rom. v.): "We be brought in favour with the Father by the death of Christ," and not by satisfaction. The same we have also in Eph. i. and Col. i. and ii.: "Christ took away the obligation or the hand-writing which was against us by the decrees, and he fastened it to the cross." (1 John i.): "The blood of Christ cleanseth and purgeth us from all sin." He saith not, our satisfaction doth purge us.

Now have we proved, by these places, that only the death of Christ is a full satisfaction for the sins of all the world, and not our filthy and unclean righteousness, which Isaiah compared unto the most defiled cloths. Let us, then, call our scourges or punishments which our loving Father sendeth us, or we take ourselves (preventing the hand of God), correction, strokes, and such other names as the Scripture useth.

This word, "satisfaction," is a proud word, and hated of all Christian ears that hear sometimes the sound of this saying of Luke, in the seventeenth chapter, "When we have done all things which he commanded unto us, yet we may say, that we be unprofitable servants." Let clay and ashes be ashamed of this proud word, "satisfaction" for sins. Shame be unto us, and righteousness unto God. If we, with our works and corrections, do make amends or satisfaction for our sins, then Christ died in vain. And by this doctrine the grace that

bringeth us into favour with God is magnified by the blood of Jesus, and man's work is little set by, to the most worthy praise of Christ's passion.

OF FREE WILL.

The new Learning.

A man hath free will and choice, not only in the state of innocency, but also of his fall and sin: and it is of so great virtue, that he, doing what lieth in him, may remove that stop and hindrance of grace, and dispose himself to grace that justifieth. And lest a carnal man, proud enough of himself, should want nourishing for his arrogancy, they go about to strengthen and confirm this doctrine with Scriptures falsely understood.

Ecclesiasticus, in the fifteenth (say they), saith and proveth free will, where God is said to have left a man in the power of his own counsel, and to have given him commandments, the which if he do keep, they should keep and save him. And to this purpose they sweep and gather together whatsoever law or admonition is anywhere in all the Scripture. As who say, we might gather well after this manner: God hath commanded that we should do this, he hath appointed the conditions of life, he threateneth pain to them that break them: therefore, it is in our power to do that same. Wot ye well, it is a sure argument.

Much like unto this the master biddeth the servant go an hundred miles a-day; ergo, he may go an hundred miles on a day. Although I see many men of great reputation almost promising themselves the victory in the defending of free will with this short argument; when in the mean season they consider not how little this doctrine maketh for the glory of Christ, which before all things ought to be sought.

Is it not a great slander of the true learning to teach after this wise? Grace given freely, or the general influence with the understanding, that understandeth or directeth right, and the will conformably willing, are enough to deserve the first grace, which maketh a man first to come in favour. Who would have looked for so much life and health in the man who was left also dead of the thieves (Luke x.), that although he could not heal himself, yet he might go into the apothecary's shop, needing no horse, might shew his grief, buy salves, and pay for them when he had done? Go to, I am content; let them teach that justification cannot be by your strength without grace that justifieth: yet they teach that the beginning of penance is in us, when they give unto us the preparing unto grace, doing as much as lieth in us that we may deserve of a seemliness the first grace by a good motion drawn out of the

freedom of the will. Is not this to give the first good motion to nature?

Moreover, they say, that a man may, by his natural strength, fulfil God's commandments, as concerning the subject of the act, although not according to the intent of the commander—that is, God. If that be true, it is in a sinner's power to amend or to continue in sin. If nature may do so much, what need have we of grace? If simple men hear those things, when shall they at any time learn Christ truly? When will they give thanks for the unspeakable benefit of their redemption?

A little thing holdeth me, but I lay on these teachers the saying of St. Peter: "They deny the Lord that bought them, and they make merchandize of the people of God with their feigned words." When did Christ or the apostles ever speak after this manner: "The merit of congruence," "the merit of worthiness to do what lieth in him," "free will," "the productive virtue of free will?" Thou Christian man, fly these sayings as the pestilent blast of the crafty serpent, wherewith he maketh nature (which is proud already) to swell against God.

Thou hast, good reader, a taste of the schoolmen's learning of free will, the which hangeth nothing together. For when they be charged with Scripture, in the despite of the Pelagians, they will be thought favourers of grace, sometime with marvellous evasion preferring a special help of God, before man's will, both in willing and in working; and a little after they leap back again to the excellent gifts of their nature, lest they should be thought to favour the Manicheans.

The authors of this learning are Pelagius the heretic, Duns, Dorbel, Holcot, Thomas de Aquino, Eckius, Cochleus, Pighius, Bilichius: and the most part of the bishops of England both teach and defend this doctrine.*

The old Learning.

(Rom. xiv.): "Whatsoever is not of faith, that is sin." Then that motion of free will before grace is sin. Then what madness is it, when a man cannot do well of himself, but only evil? What health is that, to have power to fall, and not to rise or stand without the help of another? (2 Cor. iii.): "Our sufficiency or ableness to do good is of God." (Rom. iii.): "Faith justifieth." Before faith a man is a sinner and evil; then how can he have a good motion of himself, whom faith has not stirred up? How can a thorn-tree bring forth a grape? (John viii.): "Every man that doth sin is the servant of sin." (2 Pet. ii.): "A man is brought in bondage unto him of whom he is over-

* *i. e.* The Popish Bishops.

come." (Eph. ii.): "By nature we be the children of wrath." (Gen. vi.): We be "flesh." (John iii.): Except we "be born again." (1 Cor. ii.): "A carnal man perceiveth not those things which be of the Spirit of God." Then how can the servant of sin, the son of wrath, flesh, a carnal man, before he be regenerate, have meet natural power and good motions of himself? Can an evil tree bring forth good fruit? Except that we be regenerate with the grace of Christ (according to the image of the earthly Adam), we bear no goodness: seeing that the Holy Ghost doth expressly and vehemently pronounce, that we be not only prone and ready to evil, but also evil in deed.

Furthermore, the Lord maketh laws, but (before that thou bring in this conclusion, "Therefore we may," or else wherefore have we so many precepts and threatenings?) learn of Paul (Rom. iii.), that "the law is the knowledge of sin, and not the author of righteousness. The law is spiritual, and we be carnal, sold under sin." (Rom. vii.): "Therefore thou must be spiritual, that thou mayest keep the law, which is not in thy power, but it is the grace of God." Wherefore thou mayest learn of the law to know thy misery, the which after thou hast known, thou art compelled to go to Christ, the perfection and the fulfilling of the law. The law justifieth thee not, but it declareth, to thy shame, how far thou art from the uncleanness of life by thine own fault: therefore thou mayest not think thus with thyself—I have a good law, what needeth more but my labour and diligence? I know good reason will tell me what is right; I will lay to my hands, and I will be justified by my deeds, drawn out and commanded. Not so, ye wicked persons, not so: hear and take heed of the holy words of Scripture, and the proud Pharisaical spirit shall have his comb cut.

The Israelites did cast in their minds, when the law was set forth, that they could do all things, looking on Moses' face which was covered. But it was said unto them (Deut. v.), "Who can give them such a mind to fear me, and to keep my commandments?" Surely justifying beginneth at fear and love. But ye see that they have not the fear of the Lord, nor such a mind as can do any good for itself. Therefore (Deut. xxx.) saith Moses, "The Lord shall circumcise thine heart;" and (Ezek. xi.) "I will take away the stony hearts;" and (John vi.) "There cometh no man to me, except my Father draw him." Wherefore, ye hypocrites, learn of the law your duty, feebleness, and pains; and when ye feel Moses' hand heavy, fly to Him for succour with all your heart, the which (Rom. viii.) is described to be the Fulfiller of the law.

(Mat. xi.): Christ promised rest of the soul to all them that be laden. For when we do the best that lieth in us, we, being evil trees, bring forth evil fruits—that is to say, we sin. For such as every man is, such things doth he think, speak, and work. But we be flesh, therefore we savour of fleshly things. Why do we not grant, with St. Austin, in the book of true innocency, that when a man liveth after his own way, and not after God, he is like the devil?—for an angel should not have lived after an angel, but after God, that he might stand in the truth. A man hath nought of himself, but lying and sin; but if a man have any truth or righteousness, he hath it of the well, which is Christ. And that which we have by God's liberality, hangeth of God's power, and not of our might.

First, consider well the words of the Holy Ghost (Rom. x.), where he calleth his own "the vessels of mercy;" and (Rom. viii.) "the children of God be led with the Spirit of God." (Isaiah xxvi.): "Lord, thou hast wrought all our works in us." Therefore acknowledge thyself the handiwork of the Almighty Maker, "ordained in Christ Jesus to bring forth good works, that he hath ordained—(mark, 'which he hath ordained')—that we should walk in them," (Eph. ii.) Therefore, that thou consentest to the inspiration of God, hast a good will, and workest well, the grace of God worketh all these things in thee. Thou indeed consentest, willest, and workest; but God maketh thee to consent, will, and work; so that this saying also may be always justly laid before thine eyes: "What hast thou, that thou hast not received? If thou hast received it of other, why dost thou rejoice and boast, as though thou hadst not received it?" (1 Cor. iv.) "Not unto us, Lord, not unto us, but to thy name give praise." Behold, now, not thy free will, but bound. But, "if the Son deliver thee, then shalt thou be truly free," (John. viii.) For "we be turned from sin by Christ, that we may serve righteousness," (Rom. vi.)

OF FAITH AND WORKS.

The new Learning.

Not only faith justifieth, for works justify also, and faith may stand and be without good fruits and grace that justifieth, in him that is a breaker of the commandments of God. Therefore are there two kinds of righteousness necessary to salvation—that is, to wit, of faith and works. The one without the other (except a man have no time or leisure) doth not save a man.

The authors and teachers of this doctrine are, Duns, Durand, Holcot, Bricot, Linwood, Trigerus, Eckius, Pighius, Cochleus,

Bilichius, Latomus, and many bishops of England, with their chaplains, and many doctors besides, with the whole rabble of them that are maintainers of antichrist of Rome, and his vain ceremonies.

The old Learning.

"We suppose that a man is justified by faith, without the deeds of the law," (Rom. iii.) Here the apostle doth not doubt or guess (as some do understand him amiss): for the truth of the Greek hath, "We reckon, or gather by reason." Theophylact doth expound this word, as though by reasoning he gathered this foresaid saying. Wherefore works do not justify, but faith.

And this is not my dream, but the most sure doctrine of the Holy Ghost, in the third and fourth of the Romans, where the apostle, reasoning by the Scripture of Abraham being justified, most evidently proveth that faith is reckoned to us for righteousness. "If Abraham (saith he) was justified by works, he hath whereupon he may boast, but not before God. For what saith the Scripture? (Gen. xv.) Abraham gave credence to God, and that was reckoned unto him for righteousness." And in the end of the fourth chapter he saith, that "it was not written for him only, that it was reckoned to him for righteousness, but also for us, to whom it shall be reckoned." Neither understandeth he here only the ceremonial works of the law, but also of the commandments; the which is plain (Rom. iii.), when he said that "no man was justified by the works of the law;" shortly after he saith, "for the knowledge of sin is through the law." The which clause doth sufficiently shew of what works of the law he speaketh.

If it be so, that our works also do justify, then Christ giveth but the half of our salvation, and then how many saviours shall there be? There is only but one Justifier and Saviour—that is, Christ, "by whom we be justified freely through his grace," (Rom. iii.) Therefore works do not justify, but faith in Christ; not that faith the schoolmen call *informis* (that is, a dead faith), but that true and living faith working by charity, (Gal. v.) Likewise, as we be justified before God by faith, the which is the true justification; so also before men (that see us in the face) we be justified by works—that is to say, we be known to be righteous by the fruit of good works, of the which thing the words of St. James ought to be understood.

So he that will look well on Paul's disputation of faith and works, shall easily perceive why that we say that faith alone justifieth. For we feign not with this word *alone*, a faith that

is without charity, but we shew that works are not the beginning of our justification, but the fruits and undeceivable tokens of it after that we be justified by the only grace of God, which we take hold of by faith. Also that Paul unto Titus witnesseth, saying, in the third chapter, "that we be saved by the mercy of God; we be not saved by works through the laver of regeneration, and by the renewing of the Holy Ghost, lest any man should boast of them."

Good works are not forbidden by this doctrine; but faith, the well of good works, is taught, and unto praise is given that which is her due. Part of the praise is given unto us by the new learning of schoolmen, the which thing how blasphemous it is the faithful Christian men can tell, which have read the same, wherein the saints say, "Not unto us, Lord, not unto us, but unto thy name be given praise." And so the old learning taketh not away works, but setteth them in their place, that they maybe witnesses of our faith, subdue the flesh, and serve our neighbour, but not that they should justify: seeing that only faith, of the mere mercy of God, through his word, doth justify a man.

The person that is justified worketh justly, yet for all that he doth not boast of the righteousness of works as necessary to salvation, lest, when he seeketh his own righteousness, he lose the righteousness of God that is by faith, (Rom. x.) And he granteth the very truth (Isaiah xiv.), that the righteousness of his works is like a filthy cloth, and that he is an unprofitable servant. The which is the only way to come to the true righteousness of our works—that is, when thou, working busily, yet in all thy works acknowledgest thyself a sinner, flying only to the grace of the Mediator, settest much by the price of our redemption. For if the righteousness of our works be of any value, the death of Christ hath not wholly and fully wrought our salvation: the which is blasphemous. The short argument of St. Paul standeth, and is sure and immoveable: "If the righteousness come of the law, then is Christ dead in vain; but Christ died not in vain, therefore ye boast in vain of the righteousness of works and of the law."

Moreover, the Scripture saith, that "he is accursed which abideth not in all things which are written in the book of the law." But no man abideth in all things which are written in the book of the law: therefore every man is accursed for lack of keeping the law. How shall a man, then, be saved by the keeping of the good works which are commanded in the law, when the Scripture condemneth every man for lack of keeping the commandments of God contained in the law?

Can a man be justified by the keeping of that thing for whose

transgression, without another helper, he abideth ever accursed? Well, thou dost either two good works, four, eight, or nine, and leavest out one; or thou dost all the good works that are commanded in the book of the law. If thou say that thou dost all the works of the law, St. Paul and St John prove thee a liar. Paul, to the Romans, saith, that "all men are subdued unto sin, and that all men are sinners, and have need of the glory of God." John also saith, "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us." If we be always sinners, then are we breakers of the law; if we be always breakers of the law, then can we not say that we keep the whole law: if we keep nine precepts, and break the tenth, yet, after Paul and James, are we guilty of them all: then seeing that we can never keep the whole law, we are guilty for lack of keeping the law. Therefore can neither we nor any other man be saved and justified by the works and fulfilling of the law. Therefore, to avoid this curse, we must fly for succour to Him which kept the whole law, that his fulfilling of the law by faith in Him may be our fulfilling of the law, and so we may be justified by Him alone which kept alone the whole law, and not by our works, which are always imperfect, and never able to deserve remission of sins.

This learning is agreeing unto the old psalm writer, David, which saith, "If thou, Lord, mark our righteousness, who shall be able to stand? Enter not into judgment, Lord, with thy servant."

OF MERIT OR DESERVING.

The new Learning.

When we do what lieth in us, in drawing out of a good motion towards God by the freedom of the will, we deserve the first grace of congruence and seemliness, although not of worthiness. Also the soul endued with grace, by an act drawn out of the free will and of grace, deserveth worthily everlasting life.

Behold, Christian reader, when carnal wisdom shall hear that she hath such power, and can draw forth, by natural power, a good motion toward God, and may deserve thereby, will she not fall to the Pharisaical pride? And will she not attribute to herself that which pertaineth to God? The which is nothing else but to tread under feet the Son of God, and to reckon the blood of the Testament but as an unholy and profane thing, by the which we be sanctified.

Moreover, our nature, which leaneth and setteth too much by herself, swelling with this learning, is brought into the con-

fidence of works. For nature, hearing that we partly can deserve everlasting life with our deeds, will enforce herself to heap together merits: the which being many and plenteous, she will trust unto and have a good hope in them, and when they fall and decay, she will be feeble-minded and despair: by the which error the worthiness and deserving of Christ's death is defaced and hid with darkness, and man's conscience is builded upon the sound of works, and surely at every tempest of tribulation it will fall.

The old Learning.

In the second Epistle unto Timothy, the first chapter, "God saved us not according to our works, but according to his purpose and grace, which was given unto us before the everlasting times." Such like is there also Tit. iii.; likewise Eph. ii.: "Ye be saved by grace through faith, and not of yourselves; it is the gift of God, and not of works, lest any man should boast." The Scripture here taketh away the cause of deserving or merit from our works, and giveth to grace, that we be saved; for that he saith, "not according to our works," and also, "not of you." Surely he doth not admit or receive that act or deed that is drawn out of will, to the praise of salvation or merit.

Christ deserved all things unto us with his blood; and we are justified freely, (Rom. iii.) The heritage was not gotten by our labour, but by Christ's. The faith in Christ maketh us sons, therefore heirs; therefore works do it not. (Rom. iv.): "To him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of favour, but of duty. To him that worketh not, but believeth in Him that justifieth the ungodly, is faith counted for righteousness." (Rom. vii.): "For I suppose that the afflictions of this life are not worthy the glory which shall be shewed unto us." (Luke xvii.): "When ye have done all things that be commanded you, yet say that ye be unprofitable servants." (Isaiah lxiv.): "All our righteousnesses are as defiled cloth," &c. And (1 Cor. iv.): "What hast thou, that thou hast not received?" (Rom. xi.): "Who hath given him aught aforehand, that he might be recompensed again?" (Phil. ii.): "It is God which worketh in you both the will and also the deed, even of good will." If so be that God worketh in us goodness, what shall we arrogantly claim and ascribe thereof unto our power and strength? And if we deserve the blessing, why doth Scripture call it grace? Therefore we be not saved by our merits, but only by the works and merits of Christ.

But whereas the Scripture sometime maketh mention of reward, there can no man thereupon take just occasion to swell

and be proud : for faith working by charity is the gift of God ; good works are the gift of God, so that if God reward us, we must understand that he doth not reward our works, but his own works in us. But thou, if thou claim anything thereof unto thyself, then shall thou receive no reward of glory with the wicked Pharisees, but thou shalt feel the punishment of the fire of hell.

And seeing that it is so, it may be easily judged who teacheth more truly. I, with the apostles, do always exhort men to the true good works which be done in faith, always taking heed that a man by reason of them trust not in himself, and be reproved with the Pharisee.

They do so prick and move unto good works, that they rest and put in them the hope of salvation, and the cause of merits : whereby it chanceth that everywhere men do them with this false opinion, to be justified and saved by them.

We, not despising the grace of God, do teach both that we be saved only by the grace of God, and we build men's consciences not upon works, but upon the stone—that is, Christ—against the which the gates of hell cannot prevail, and do always lean on this most comfortable Gospel, or glad tidings, “The heritage is given by faith, that the promises may be sure and of grace,” as saith Paul (Rom. iv. and v.) We being justified, therefore, by faith, have peace with God through Christ, and not by our merits.

• OF SIN.

The new Learning.

The lust or concupiscence that remaineth in a man after baptism, the law of the members, infirmity, or sickness, is no sin, neither venial nor mortal ; and after baptism it is not original, but is the pain of sin : nevertheless, it bringeth forth sin. This opinion maketh a man that is baptized slow and dull to fight against the flesh, for he believeth that he is all whole and in safeguard.

The old Learning.

Concupiscence,* which sheweth itself by its evil fruits, even in a man that is baptized, is sin of itself, (Rom. vii.) Here the apostle saith, “Now I mine own self do not this, but the sin which dwelleth and remaineth in me.” The apostle doth not here speak in the person of wicked men : for wicked men do not consent to the law, they serve and obey not the law of God with their mind.

* The article says : It has the nature of sin.

St. Austin was sometime of this opinion, that the apostle had spoken these words in the person of evil men; but in his retractions and against Julian he doth revoke this opinion, and he saith that at that time he understood not the apostle aright. Now he that speaketh so, was baptized, and was the elect instrument of God, and yet complaineth of concupiscence, and calleth it sin. Then let the schoolmen tell, whether the apostle doth well call that concupiscence which bringeth forth evil fruits (except it be stopped), sin or no. Yea, let them tell, whether the Holy Ghost did err in the word *verily*. (1 Cor. xiv.): The apostle thanketh God that he spake more with tongues than all the Corinthians did. Therefore so great an apostle knew with what words he should name concupiscence.

When we follow that manner of speaking, we are checked, mocked, and cast out as heretics, of them that are little moved with the cause of so great matters, so that they may triumph in the world and live in peace. Then the truth is, that concupiscence (the which bringeth forth the same fruits after baptism that it did before) is called sin: as the apostle doth exhort them that be baptized (Rom. vi.): "Let not sin reign in your mortal bodies." He doth not say concupiscence, but sin, for so hath the Greek text.

Moreover, there is no man but he knoweth that sin is known by the law; but this concupiscence is forbidden of the law, for it is sin. Infirmities surely, and also pains, do not fall under the precept. And it is known that the apostle saith (Rom. vii.), "I did not know sin but by the law, for I had not known that concupiscence had been a sin, if the law had not said, Thou shalt not lust;" and by-and-by he calleth it "sin." But this is the difference, namely, before the baptism of the Spirit and water, that concupiscence or lust was a sin reigning, but after the washing of regeneration it is sin overcome and subdued. Of its own nature, indeed, it is evil; but a man truly regenerate, and not walking after the flesh, doth repress and hold down sin with the Spirit of grace, that it reign not, nor have the over hand, that there be "no damnation unto them that be grafted in Christ," (Rom. viii.) For it is not reckoned to his damnation, on account of the Spirit that resisteth the flesh. The which thing St. Austin in these words doth conclude: "All sin is forgiven in baptism, not that it should not be at all, but that it should not be reckoned for sin."

Now judge, good reader, which of us speak more truly. They that make so light a thing of this old leaven of malice (calling it a little infirmity only, which nevertheless is no venial sin), do not know the grace of God, and do blaspheme us, that make a great thing of it: as it is a great thing in very deed, and

causeth that we should have need of the great grace of God. We do exalt and magnify, with kind devotion and godliness, the blood of Christ, wherewith all is purged and redeemed, that we lowly confessors of our sins may find grace in the eyes of God, the just Judge.

OF WORSHIPPING OF SAINTS.

The new Learning.

Not only Christ is our Mediator, but also the saints, which reign in heaven with Christ: wherefore they ought to be called upon as mediators of intercession, the which purchase unto us many good things. Our Lord, dividing his kingdom, hath committed the one half of his kingdom (that is, mercy) to the saints, to be given and distributed unto the world: the other part (that is, judgment) he keepeth behind for himself. For he that will obtain any thing of a prince, he feeleth out some man of authority, at whose request he may obtain that he will have: the which should not speed, if he came to the prince alone.

Mary, the Mother of God, if she brake the head of the old serpent, why should she not be a mean for mankind? Therefore our Lady and the saints do work partly our salvation. The blessed Virgin is the neck, Christ is the head, and we be the members. No good gifts come down unto the members, but through Mary, as the neck. Also the saints work miracles; for how many being sick with divers sicknesses have been holpen at the monuments and tombs of the saints? This is the doctrine of all the Papists, which have written for these five hundred years.

The old Learning.

A sinner alone may not appear in the sight of God ("for our God is a consuming fire," Heb. xiii.), except he be brought to him by a mediator, for whose merit's sake he doth forgive the sinner's trespasses. Christ is the Mediator (1 Tim. ii.; Heb. ix.; Rom. viii.); our satisfaction (1 John, ii.); our righteousness (1 Cor. i.); our priest for ever (Psa. cix.; Heb. iv. v. vii. viii. ix. x.) Christ is not a fearful judge to faithful men, but an advocate, calling unto him those that be heavy laden, (Matt. xi.) He is of so great mercy, that he gave his life for his sheep, (John x.; Matt. xx.) Then we ought not to be afraid of Christ,

as if he were a judge, but we ought to come to the throne of grace, because we be sinners, that so we may be delivered from sin, for he is the Lamb, &c. (Matt. ix. ; Luke v.) He came not into this world to call righteous men, &c.

A sick man feareth not a physician, but the sicker that he is, the more desirous he is of the physician. Shall that Physician that died for us, when we were yet sinners (Rom. v.), be now inconstant, and do nothing but threaten and kill, so that we have need of some man to play the mediator and mean between him and us, to assuage his wrath? O unseemly thought of a Christian man! What a carnal and fleshly dream is this! How fond a kind of fellows are these! How unlearned in the Scriptures! Who died for us? Did Stephen or Peter? Did not Christ die for us? And that for such a charity as is not able to be expressed? (John xv.): "Greater love than this can no man have, even that a man bestow his life for his friends:" and yet, for all that great charity, we dream that Christ is a fearful tyrant, and that he will put away a wretched sinner needing a physician with a cruel countenance, and commit him to the tormentors, except he bring some saint with him.

So worship we now the Son of God, which humbled himself to the death of the cross, that we do not believe his words, when he saith, "Come to me, and I shall refresh you," "I am the way," "I bestow my life for my sheep;" but dare be so bold as to accuse him of lying, and say, "These be void words, which thou dost say; thou hast committed mercy to the saints; thou canst do nothing but threaten and undo sinners. I will turn me to some of the saints, which shall be my patron and advocate by thee."

Are not these sayings wicked and ungodly? Yet they that would be reckoned most holy of all, be of this mind and opinion, and they condemn us of heresy before the matter is known. The Scripture biddeth us ask in the name of Christ such things as we have need of (John xvi.), and not in the name of saints. Reconciliation and salvation are in none other name, (Acts iv.) The priesthood of Christ is for evermore. And the apostle saith (Rom. viii.), that Christ remaineth and abideth at the right hand of the Father, and maketh intercession for us. He is the way to the Father, (John xiv.) By him we have an entrance to come to the Father, (Eph. ii.) By him we have boldness and entrance to God in all confidence, through the faith in him, (Eph. iii.) He is our hope, (1 Tim. i.) He came that he might save sinners, (1 Tim. i.) He gave himself an oblation to God for us, (Eph. v.)

And we, among so many praises of burning charity and free

mercy, have not learned yet to trust in Him, which is our reconciler and bringer in favour; who is so gentle and liberal, that he did not disdain to be an oblation for sin for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God through him, who is so mighty that they that believe in him cannot be ashamed, (Rom. ix.)

Furthermore, the mother that is a virgin usurpeth or taketh unto her none of these things that they sing to her praise. I pray you for shame, dare the corrupters of Scripture give that unto the mother which the Holy Ghost did prophecy of the Son of God? (Gen. iii.) For he, and not she, did break the serpent's head. Insomuch that I cannot tell whether I should marvel more at the gross and rustical ignorance of these great masters, or that I should cry out upon the wicked and ungodly opinion that they have of Christ. They have so little regard to what they say, that all the thought that they take is, that always they shall be saying something.

And even, as in times past, the philosophers of the sect of Epicurus and the Stoics affirmed that God did none otherways, and had none other subsistence than they imagined him to have, and described the nature of God with vain dreams and devices of their opinions: likewise, our false divines imagine Christ to give from him his mercy to saints, and to be a fearful Judge, and that he damneth all sinners, except that he be pleased and assuaged by the intercession of some saint. And this imagination pleaseth them well, and they command the Church so to believe.

These fellows also make Mary the neck of the mystical body. Who can abstain from laughing, yea, rather weeping? They make articles of faith, besides the Scriptures, of their own brain; and where they should only stick to the Scripture, they bring forth old wives' fables for sound and true things, measuring all godly things with the plummet or line of our reason, and by the similitudes of this world. And whereas they trifle both unlearnedly and ungodlily, yet they be not afraid to drive to the fire as many as will not play the fools with them. And that in all points they may play the false doctors, they wrest the Scriptures to confirm their errors; of the which thing I have spoken very largely in our common places.

But lest any man should think that I say this in the reproach of saints, so I think that saints should be worshipped, but after the rule of Scripture; seeing that they be the glorious members of the mystical body, the household of God, and joined unto us with the most sure bond of charity. For charity perisheth not,

but is made perfect in heaven: wherefore they love us, and covet with a brotherly love our amendment. Therefore let us reverently and holily keep the memory and remembrance of them, in whom we may see the wisdom of God, his goodness, power, and the unspeakable riches of his mercy, to the exercise of our faith, hope, and charity. For as oft as we remember their manly fightings against the gates of hell, and the manifold grace of God, the which the Father of all comfort poured forth upon the vessels of mercy, we are lifted up in hope and trust of so great goodness; and we be provoked to the following of so great perseverance by their virtues, set out as vehement enticements.

What good and devout man is there, but he will desire with all his heart that he might overcome the enemy of our salvation with such strength of faith as the saints were endued and harnessed withal? that at last, his enemies being overcome, he might be associated and accompanied for evermore with the elect and chosen of God. And when he doth see so excellent vessels of glory made of the children of wrath, and of the lump of perdition, not by man's merit, but by the power of the grace of God, that he will conceive a trusty hope of so merciful a Father, the which made us worthy when he found us unworthy. Then if we pray to God for faith, hope, and charity, and seek the kingdom of heaven before all other things, that we may follow the footsteps of the right saints, then have we worshipped the saints very well, and even as we should do. For the will of God and the saints is one; wherefore what other thing will they ask, than the amendment of a sinner, and the continual recording and remembrance of the laws of God?

But that we should fly for succour to them in our adversity and need, that they may be means between us and God, they neither do require it, for they seek nothing but the glory of God; neither can we desire them to be mediators for us, except we do injury to the most perfect and most sufficient Mediator of all. Now seeing that the Scripture is our candle, in the most dark night of this world, we be more sure that call upon God by Christ (the which thing the Scripture doth command), than they which imagine new kinds of worshipping invocations, of the which the Scripture maketh no mention at all.

“Call upon me (saith the Lord) in the time of tribulation, and I shall deliver thee, and thou shalt honour me,” (Psa. xlv.) And (Joel ii.) “Whosoever will call on the name of God for help shall be saved.” And in this matter we force not upon long time or long custom, for Christendom or a Christian man's

living standeth not in the passing over long time, or in the oldness or antiquity of custom, but in the Scripture of everlasting truth.

Now, good reader, judge what kind of Christian men they be that fasten their hope not in Christ, but in creatures, knowing nothing at all, how much help we have in Christ: they differ very little from idolators. And while they go about most earnestly to honour saints, they dishonour them most far out of rule and fashion that can be, even when they give away from God to the creature, hope and confidence, the which is due only to God. As touching the miracles, read the twenty-fourth chapter of Matthew, and the second Epistle to the Thessalonians, and your mind shall be at rest and certified.

NOTES.

HOOPER ON THE OFFICE AND CHARACTER OF CHRIST.

JOHN HOOPER was born in Somersetshire, in 1495, and entered of Merton College, Oxford, in 1514, under the tuition of his uncle, John Hooper, a fellow of that house. In 1518 he was admitted B.A.; the only degree he took in this University. It is supposed that he afterwards became one of the number of Cistercians, or white monks, and continued some years, until, becoming averse to a monastic life, he returned to Oxford, where, by the writings of some of the Reformers which had reached that place, he was induced to embrace the principles of Protestantism. In 1539, when the statute of the six articles was put in execution, he left Oxford, and got into the service of Sir Thomas Arundel, a Devonshire gentleman, to whom he became chaplain and steward of his estate; but this gentleman, discovering his principles, withdrew his protection, and he was then obliged to go to France, where he continued for some time among the Reformed, until his dislike of some of their proceedings made him return to England; but being again in danger here, he, in the disguise of a sailor, escaped to Ireland, and thence to Holland and Switzerland. At Zurich he met with Bullinger, himself a refugee from his country for the sake of religion, and who, therefore, gave Hooper a friendly reception. During his residence here, Hooper married a Burgundian lady.

On the accession of King Edward, in 1547, Hooper was enabled to return to England, and settled in London, where he frequently preached the doctrines of the Reformation; but had imbibed abroad such notions on the subject of Church government, and the habits, as rendered his principles somewhat suspected by Archbishop Cranmer, and Ridley, and prevented his co-operating with them so cordially as could have been wished in that critical time. In doctrinal matters, however, he was an able assistant, being a man of learning, and a good philosopher and critic. When Bonner was to be deprived of his bishopric he was one of his accusers; which no doubt would recommend him as an acceptable sacrifice in the following bloody reign. By the interest of the Earl of Warwick he was nominated and elected Bishop of Gloucester; but when he came to be consecrated or invested by Archbishop Cranmer and Bishop Ridley he refused to wear a canonical habit; and it was not until these ceremonies were dispensed with by the king's authority that he was consecrated bishop, in 1550; and about two years after he had the bishopric of Worcester given to him, to keep *in commendam* with the former. He now preached often, visited his dioceses, kept great hospitality for the poor, and was beloved by many.

But in the persecution under Mary, being then near sixty years of age, and refusing to recant his opinions, he was burned in the city of Gloucester, Feb. 9, 1554, and suffered death with admirable constancy.—*Chalmers's General Biographical Dictionary.*

Wherefore, to the intent that man might be delivered out of this wretched and miserable state whereunto he had brought himself, and might recover again the same things that were given unto him in his first creation, and thereby attain the everlasting bliss in heaven, it pleased Almighty God, of his great and infinite mercy and goodness, to send his only-begotten Son, the second Person in the Trinity, to take upon him the nature of man, and therein to work the mystery of our redemption—that is to say, to deliver us from the captivity of the devil, sin, and damnation, and to be the very mean of our reconciliation to God, and of our justification. And sure this reconciliation of mortal man to the favour of God immortal did necessarily require such a Mediator between them as had in himself the perfect nature of them both; which is the very property of a mean between two, to be partner with both of them between whom he taketh upon him to be a mean. For if he be wholly joined with the one, and clearly separated from the other, then he is not meet to be a mean or mediator between two which be at debate and enmity. Wherefore our Saviour Christ, being naturally God, took upon him the nature of man, that he might thereby be conversant among men, and by his death redeem them; and yet he still retained and kept his Godhead, and was both God and man together. For if he had been man only, and not God, then his death could not have been a worthy and sufficient satisfaction for sin to the justice of God; and if he had been only God, and not man, then he, by his bodily conversation, could not have called us again to God, nor suffered and died bodily for us. And this property of a mediator St. Paul considering, writeth to Timothy, that “there is but one Mediator between God and man, which is Christ Jesus;” meaning thereby, that because he only had both the natures in him, therefore he only, and none other but he, was able to be a sufficient mediator and mean of our reconciliation to God, and of our justification.—*Necess. Erud. sign. e.*

[A LETTER OF RECONCILIATION FROM BISHOP RIDLEY TO BISHOP HOOPER].

My dearly beloved brother and fellow elder, whom I reverence in the Lord, pardon me, I beseech you, that hitherto, since your captivity and mine, I have not saluted you by my letters; whereas I do indeed confess I have received from you (such was your gentleness) two letters at sundry times; but yet at such time as I could not be suffered to write unto you again, or if I might, yet was I in doubt how my letters might safely come into your hands. But now, my dear brother, forasmuch as I understand by your works, which I have but superficially seen, that we thoroughly agree and wholly consent together in those things which are the grounds and substantial points of

our religion, against the which the world so furiously rageth in these our days, howsoever in time past, in certain by-matters and circumstances of religion, your wisdom and my simplicity, I grant, hath a little jarred, each of us following the abundance of his own sense and judgment; now, I say, be you assured, that even with my whole heart, God is my witness, in the bowels of Christ I love you in the truth, and for the truth's sake, which abideth in us, and, as I am persuaded, shall, by the grace of God, abide in us for evermore.

And because the world (as I perceive, brother) ceaseth not to play his pageant, and busily conspireth against Christ our Saviour, with all possible force and power, exalting high things against the knowledge of God, let us join hands together in Christ, and if we cannot overthrow, yet, to our power, and as much as in us lieth, let us shake those high altitudes, not with carnal, but with spiritual weapons; and withal, brother, let us prepare ourselves to the day of our dissolution; by the which, after the short time of this bodily affliction, by the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, we shall triumph together with him in glory.

I pray you, brother, salute in my name your reverend fellow-prisoner and venerable father, D.C., by whom, since the first day that I heard of his most godly and fatherly constancy in confessing the truth of the Gospel, I have conceived great consolation in the Lord. For the integrity and uprightness of that man, his gravity and innocency, all England I think hath known long ago. Blessed be God, therefore, which, in such abundance of iniquity and decay of all godliness, hath given unto us, in his reverend old age, such a witness for the truth of his Gospel. Miserable and hard-hearted is he whom the godliness and constant confession of so worthy, so grave, and so innocent a man will not move to acknowledge and confess the truth of God.

I do not now, brother, require you to write anything to me again; for I stand much in fear lest your letters should be intercepted before they can come to my hands: nevertheless, know you that it shall be to me great joy to hear of your constancy and fortitude in the Lord's quarrel. And albeit I have not hitherto written unto you, yet have I twice (as I could) sent unto you my mind, touching the matters which in your letters you required to know. Neither can I yet, brother, be otherwise persuaded: I see, methinks, so many perils, whereby I am earnestly moved to counsel you not to hasten the publishing of your works, especially under the title of your own name; for I fear greatly lest by this occasion both your mouth should be stopped hereafter and all things taken away from the rest of the prisoners whereby, otherwise, if it so please God, they may be able to do good to many. Farewell in the Lord, my most dear brother; and if there be any more in prison with you for Christ's cause, I beseech you, as you may, salute them in my name: to whose prayers I do most humbly and heartily commend myself and my fellow-prisoners and captives in the Lord. And yet once again and for ever in Christ, my most dear brother, farewell.

N. RIDLEY.

Hooper scrupled the ceremonies under the notion of Popish ceremonies, and under the same notion Ridley would have hated and rejected

them. Ridley and the other bishops said, in defence of these ceremonies, that they were small matters, and that the fault was in the abuse of the things, and not in the things themselves; and that Hooper ought not to be so stubborn in so light a matter, and that his wilfulness therein was not to be suffered. And would not Hooper himself have passed the same censure upon his own refusal if he had had just the same thoughts and opinion of the ceremonies? But he thought, that a thing in itself indifferent, but having been abused to superstitious purposes, could never after be looked upon as indifferent and innocent; but it must of necessity pass under that notion which common and corrupt usage had put upon it; and that it was spoiled, and had utterly lost its former indifferency: for which reason these rites and ceremonies were offensive to his conscience, as the king's grant of dispensation to him, by advice of the privy council, expresses it. But Cranmer and Ridley, and the other bishops, were so far determined by the laws, that the king's dispensation, granted to Hooper upon that occasion, did not take place; nor, indeed, was it in their power to admit of it. For being these ceremonies were enacted by law, and fastened to the freehold, and made part of the establishment, by the universal consent of the nation, nothing but the same consent could take them away again.

Now, therefore, the nicety of the difference betwixt them lay in this—whether ceremonies, which were once indifferent and had been abused, might be so purged and freed from those abuses as to become indifferent and fit to be used again. And this is a matter so hard to be decided that it must be weighed in gold scales, where the very least moment, or even a man's breath, on the one side or the other is sufficient to incline the balance; for it is with indifferent ceremonies and usages as it is with words that are indifferent. The word *ballad* was once an innocent and inoffensive word, and signified as the word *song* now does; but the word has been abused and applied to the meanest and most rascally sort of poetry, and has for a long time been taken in the worsen sense. Suppose, therefore, that some men, desirous to speak as their forefathers did, who called the book of Canticles the ballad of ballads, as reverently as we now call it the song of songs, should say, that if authority require that this word be used in its first and best sense, why then we may very lawfully and reverently use it in that sense again; because, though the word has been abused and ill applied, yet the fault is in the abuse of the word, and not in the word itself. And further, that no man ought to refuse to read that book upon this trifling account—because he dislikes the title of it—especially when a public law has declared, that the selfsame is meant by this title as if the Dissenter had had the wording of it himself to his own mind, and had called it the hymn of hymns. This is the substance of what Cranmer and Ridley said.

On the other hand, Hooper's opinion in this supposed case was, that though our forefathers had used that word very religiously and reverently, yet it had since been so corrupted and abused, and had contracted so profane a signification as no authority could wholly deface, nor could so inoffensively restore the word to be used in reli-

gious matters any more, but that sober men would always have a prejudice against it. This was Hooper's very sense; he looked upon the Reformed ceremonies as still retaining a Popish twang. But though a law could not cure his prejudices, yet that and the higher considerations of doing service in the Church of God did quite overrule them; and he wisely complied with those ceremonies, which, if he had been left to his choice, he would rather have forborne.

I must confess that Ridley says these diminishing things of himself in the absence of the law, and after those statutes which enacted these ceremonies were repealed and swallowed up by Popery; for which cause it cannot be expected that the Church of England clergy should make such condescensions at this time as Ridley did, and acknowledge their simplicity in adhering to the laws. For laws, while they are in being, have as much reverence due to them as is owing to the wisdom of the whole community by which they were made, and nothing else but our pre-engagements to God himself can excuse us from the observance of them: and therefore it cannot be required by the Dissenters, in order to that good understanding which I here endeavour and humbly beg there may be amongst Protestants, that we should arraign five-and-twenty statute laws at once under the infamous name of Draconica; especially when by one of the Draconica the whole Church of England, and, under the covert of the Church of England, all the Dissenters in England hold their bibles. No; every wise and considerate Protestant, though he be not a non-conformist, would rather lie under all the penalties of non-conformity than go about to weaken or undermine the authority of the laws which secure to all Protestants their lives, and a much greater thing than their lives, I mean the Bible, which, I say again, is the whole religion of all Protestants. As for by-matters, they may very well be left where the law, for ages immemorial, has lodged all the concerns of the English Church, which is in a lawful English Parliament; whose necessary power in that behalf appears by the very writ, both of their summons and of their due election. And in the mean time, notwithstanding our different apprehensions about them, let us love one another.—*Anonymous Pamphlet in Bishop Gibson's Collection.*

TURNER ON THE OLD AND NEW LEARNING.

(*Extracts from Bishop White's Orthodox Faith Justified.*)

Proposition 1. The holy Scripture, and primitive Fathers, describing remission of sins, teach that the same is a free condonation of the crime and guilt of sin, for the merit of Christ.

The Fathers also teach, that remission of sin is a free condonation. Augustine: "What is it for God to become propitious to iniquity? It is to be pardoning and granting forgiveness." Bernard: "It is sufficient for me, to all justice, only to have him propitious whom I have offended: all the sin which he hath decreed not to impute unto me, it is as though it were not" Augustine: "Sin is unloosed by indulgence."

Proposition 2. Together with the action of God remitting sin con-

curreth another action of divine grace, enabling man to forsake and mortify every greater sin which God pardoneth, (1 Cor. vi. 11 ; Heb. ix. 14 ; Rev. i. 5, 6 ; 1 Pet. ii. 9 ; Ezek. xxxvi. 26 ; Isaiah liii. 5 ; Ps. ciii. 3). Augustine saith, "Remission of sins maketh men good trees." Bernard : "Sins are not only pardoned, but the gift of sanctity is conferred." And Chrysostom : "Delivering from sin, he ingrafteth righteousness ; yea, he extinguisheth sin and suffereth it not to be." And like as when Naaman was healed (2 Kings, v.), his leprosy was removed, and his flesh restored to his natural health and beauty ; so when God remitteth sin, he removeth the guilt by free pardon, and conferreth grace, to the destroying of sin and healing the soul, (Ps. ciii. 3 ; Mic. vii. 19).

We are free from the absurd opinion wherewith our adversaries charge us ; to wit, that we hold when sins are pardoned God doth not change the mind of the sinner, neither destroy the blot of sin ; but the same remaining in the soul in the like manner it did before condonation, is only taken away by a not imputation of the guilt ; for we believe, as I have delivered before, using a twofold explication—

First, the destruction and abolition of the sin remitted is a work of sanctification, and not of justification, strictly taken, according to St. Paul, (Rom. iv.)

Secondly, according to the nature of the sin, so is the extirpation or destruction thereof.

Whensoever foul, enormous, and mortal sins (1 Cor. vi. 9 ; Eph. v. 6 ; 1 John, iii. 8), which Tertullian calleth *graviora et exitiosa*, "more grievous and exitious," are pardoned by God's mercy, the same are abolished and cease to be ; yea, ordinarily before the Lord forgiveth them a sinner beginneth to detest and forsake them, (Prov. xxviii. 13 ; Isaiah i. 16 ; 2 John, i. 6, 7, and iii. 6).

But habitual concupiscence, *et delicta quotidianæ incursionis*, many smaller offences, and delinquencies of daily incursion, which, by reason of our frailty, we can never be free from in this life (1 John, i. 8), remain in just persons, and the Lord forgives them upon these conditions :—

First, that his children be humbled because of them, (Rom. vii. 24).

Secondly, that they so far repress and mortify them, as that they lead them not to foul and wilful offences.

Thirdly, that by confession, prayer, alms-deeds, exhibiting mercy and forgiveness to others, and other deeds of piety and charity, they crave at God's hand the forgiveness of them, (Prov. xvi. 6 ; Matt. vi. 14, and vii. 7 ; Acts x. 2, 4 ; 1 John, i. 9 ; Lam. v. 17 ; Matt. vi. 17 ; 1 Pet. iv. 8).

If men forsake not damnable crimes (1 Cor. vi. 9, 10 ; 1 John, iii. 8) they shall never be forgiven, (Ezek. xviii. 13, 21 ; 1 John, i. 6). And no sins may be esteemed so small as that we neglect the means of procuring pardon for them.

Proposition 3. Many of our learned adversaries destroy that which is principal and most essential in remission of sins ; to wit, condonation.

Vasquez, the Jesuit, saith, "Even as the true reason of inherent justice can by no means be explicated, unless we say that that which is in us wanteth no favour and new acceptation of God, to make us

just and holy before him ; so also the same cannot be defended, unless we affirm that thereby, as by a contrary form, the whole blot and offence of sin is taken away without any favour or condonation of God."

The said author confirmeth his opinion by these two arguments especially:—

Arg. 1. The Trident Council makes inherent justice the form of justification ; and hereupon, forasmuch as whensoever the form of anything is united to the subject, presently the thing hath the constitution and being ; if, after the infusion of divine grace, a condonation were required on God's part (as Bellarmine, Suarez, and others, affirm), then inherent justice were not a sufficient and perfect form.

Arg. 2. If a condonation be admitted for the merit of Christ, then the merit of Christ imputed is the formal cause of that condonation ; and, granting this, the justification of a sinner must have two forms, one of remission of sins, the other of inward cleansing and sanctification. But this is contrary to the Trident Council, affirming that "justification hath but one form." And it differs very little from the doctrine of the Protestants : for in the principal it is one with it ; to wit, in that it holdeth that a justified person doth next and immediately receive the remission of sins for the merit of Christ imputed. And the smaller difference between the sides ; to wit, whether inherent justice may be admitted a part of justification ; might be qualified by some such modification as Vega propoundeth to Calvin, saying, " If at all times when one is justified he is also sanctified, what offence is it to allow one common word (namely, justification) to express and contain both these parts ? "

I am not ignorant that many other Papists admit condonation ; but Vasquez chargeth that opinion with having affinity with ours, and affirmeth and proveth that it is repugnant to the Trident Council.

Our adversaries maintain that inherent justice, in all regenerate persons, is in this life absolute and perfect ; and the most famous in their school teach that it is so, without any further mercy and favour of God besides the first production thereof. And this is a necessary principle, whereupon the frame of their justification dependeth ; for, seeing no effect exceedeth the cause from whence it proceedeth, if inherent justice be defective and imperfect, then the formal effects thereof, to wit, the expulsion of sin, to make a man just, acceptable to God, and heir of heaven, must be imperfect ; and such virtues as proceed from the habit of that imperfect justice can neither merit nor satisfy in condignity.

But that inherent justice is imperfect appeareth by sayings of holy Scripture, testimony of primitive Fathers, and confession of many learned Papists.

First, the Scripture teacheth that a just man's righteousness is defective, imperfect, and mixed with uncleanness, (Rom. vii. 18 ; Job ix. 20 ; Isaiah lxiv. 6).

And howsoever the Jesuits shake off these testimonies, yet the same in former times were understood by learned Papists and other doctors, as we expound them.

Gerson allegeth the place of Isaiah lxiv. 6, saying, " ' Who can glory

that he hath a clean heart? Who can say, I am innocent and pure? Whereas Isaiah himself, with the rest, becoming vile in his own eyes, pronounceth, in a lowly confession, ‘All our righteousness is as the rags of a menstruous woman, and as the clothes of lepers, defiled with mattery filth.’ Bernard: “What can all our justice be before the Lord?—shall it not, according to the prophet, be accounted as a menstruous garment? And, if it be strictly judged, all our justice will be found unjust, and having less than it ought. What shall we say, then, of our sins, when our righteousness is not able to answer for itself?” And in another place: “Our mean justice, if it be any, is, peradventure, upright, but not pure, unless we value ourselves above our fathers, who, no less truly than humbly, have confessed, ‘all our righteousness is as the cloth of a menstruous woman;’ and how can that be pure justice wherein sin is not as yet wanting?” And in the same manner Bonaventure, Cajetan, and the Enchiridion of Colen, expound that place of Isaiah.

The place of Job, chap. ix. 20, is expounded by Gregory, of the imperfection and uncleanness of our works, saying, “All our justice is manifestly proved to be injustice, if it be narrowly judged. And how much soever we travel in good works, we never attain true cleanness, but only imitate it.”

Secondly, whereas inherent justice consisteth principally of faith, hope, and charity; if these virtues be imperfect, then all our righteousness wanteth perfection. But that the same are imperfect appears by the Scriptures, exhorting just persons to increase in these virtues (Luke xvii. 5; Eph. iv. 15; James i. 4; 2 Pet. iii. 18), and reproving such as, having the same in verity, wanted degrees of perfection, (Matt. xiv. 31; Rev. ii. 19, 20; Job xxxviii. 1, with Job xl. 5).

Arg. 2. From the testimonies of the Fathers.

Augustine saith, “Poor am I, and miserable; and, being as yet congealed in the uncleanness of the earthly image, do, in earthly affections and terrene actions, more resemble the first Adam than the second.” And again: “Being renewed by faith and hope, how many old things do we?—for we are so clothed with Christ, as that we carry some of the rags of the old Adam about us.”

St. Augustine and all his scholars affirm, that the good works of just persons are imperfect in this life, and have not the purity which the law of God requireth.

Augustine: “No man loveth God so much as the unchangeable rule of verity requires, and that which is less is sin. And the righteousness of this life is inchoate, according to the measure of our infirmity—a certain smaller justice. The same is called true, because it is unfeigned; yet not altogether fair, but by comparison: called perfect, because by the uprightness of a direct course it moveth towards perfection, wanting damnable crimes: unfeigned, but not pure: such as needeth God’s eye to look upon it, *affectu pietatis, non judicio veritatis*: by the compassion of fatherly piety, and not by the judgment of verity.” And the cavil which modern Papists use, saying, “The righteousness of just persons is called imperfect and impure, in respect of the purity of the divine nature, or of the glorious state of the heavenly saints,” is

censured by St. Jerome, saying, "No flesh shall be justified in thy sight; he speaketh not in comparison, as old and new heretics teach."

Also the Fathers generally affirm, that the good deeds of just men, after they be wrought, "have need of mercy, and must be presented to God with prayer, and be excused by his mercy, and they cannot go with safety to God's tribunal without mercy; and they must borrow weight from the bowels of the Lord, and receive supply of that which is less from him." And Isidore saith, "At the bar of the judge the righteousness of a just person is not secure; and the very justice of the righteousness must be justified by God, otherwise before him it is sin." And Chrysostom: "The repentance of man alone could not wipe away sin, but that is mixed with the mercy of God." And Hugo Victorinus: "God by his grace bestoweth upon man faith, which faith again, by grace, he reputeth for perfection, even as if it were perfect."

Another pillar of Popish justification is, that radical concupiscence, together with the first suggestions, agitation, and rebellion of the same, is not sin; for if the same be sin, then it followeth, first, that just persons are always sinners, having continually need of remission, and not imputation, of sin. Secondly, if concupiscence be sin, forasmuch as the same worketh in all the actions of man, it will distil into the same sinfulness; and thereby distain, impair, and attenuate them, so far as that they cannot attain to that height and strain of perfection, whereby they shall be able to justify before God, and to satisfy and merit.

Object. Concupiscence may be only venial, and then it cannot hinder or impair the perfection of justice.

Ans. Granting the same to be a sin, it cannot be venial by nature, because it is a transgression of the last commandment in the proper object of the same, (Rom. vii. 7). And that sin cannot be venial by nature which caused the apostle to cry out, "Oh, wretched man that I am," &c. (Rom. vii. 24).

And if it be only venial by indulgence, and not imputation, this cannot hinder the physical or real influence thereof into man's habits and actions, more than the not imputation of original sin stoppeth the propagation of the uncleanness thereof into the posterity. Also, admitting the same in just persons to be venial, yet it hath so frequent and perpetual motions, that such a multitude of irregular cogitations and desires which the same produceth will equal some mortal sins; even as many lesser crannicks in a ship equal one big one, and many small grains of sand make a heavy burden. And the perpetual conjunction and concomitance, yea, mixture of these sins with the purest motions and holiest actions of just persons, cause the same always to have need of remission, by reason whereof they cannot justify, merit, satisfy, &c.

Object. But the holy Scripture and primitive Fathers manifestly teach, that habitual concupiscence and the motions thereof are not sin.

Ans. First, the Scripture doth as expressly make it sin as the same doth theft, adultery, false witness, prohibiting and condemning it by a special commandment, (Exod. xx. 17; Rom. vii. 7). And that the apostle (Rom. vii.) speaketh of habitual concupiscence, appeareth by the actions which he ascribeth unto it, teaching that in himself it lusted

against the spirit, and rebelled against the law of the mind ; and yet, in regard of his consent, was involuntary, and resisted him (v. 20) ; and also it was such from which he could never be freed so long as he continued in this life. And the same apostle calleth it by the name of sin five times in Rom. vi., and six times in Rom. vii., and thrice in Rom. viii. it hath the definition of sin ; for it is repugnant to the divine law, (Rom. vii. 7, 23 ; 1 John, iii. 4). It hath the quality of sin, and is hateful to God and good men, (Rom. vii. 15). It is the very root of the evil tree, and grand stem which bringeth forth evil fruits (Matt. vii. 18) ; the mother of all sin ; and whatsoever ignorance, unbelief, injustice, and wickedness, is committed by man, proceed from it, (Matt. xv. 19 ; Gal. v. 19 ; James ii. 14, 15).

Secondly, St. Augustine, whose judgment in this matter is a breviary of the faith of the primitive Church, expressly teacheth that it is sin ; and this not only in appellation, but in verity, saying, " Even as the cecity of the heart, which God removeth by illumination, is both a sin, and the punishment of sin ; and the cause of sin, so the concupiscence of the flesh, against which the good Spirit striveth, is a sin, by reason there is in it disobedience against the dominion of the mind ; and a punishment of sin, because it is rendered to him which was disobedient, and a cause of sin." And in another place : " This unreasonable and brutish anger would not arise unless there were sin in the members."

The same Father calleth it " a culpable quality, a brutish motion, an evil and naughty sin, no small iniquity." He saith " it is prohibited by the moral law, and is unlawful, lascivious, and filthy. Before baptism it is mortal sin, even original sin itself." And after baptism " it is taken away in regard of guiltiness, and remaineth in act. And after baptism it must be purged by remission."

And whereas this Father saith in one place, " Concupiscence in persons regenerate is no sin." The answer is, that he simply denieth it not to be sin, but only that it is not imputed as mortal sin to such as resist it ; and because it reigneth not, nor maketh them unjust persons who resist it ; and is no crime ; and intrudeth itself upon just persons, as an importunate guest, against their wills ; and, lastly, because it is daily wasting, and tending to destruction, and not being.

And, verily, until of late time, the best learned and godliest in the Church taught that it was sin. Isidore saith, " It is a filthy motion of the soul in the affection of unclean lust." And Hugo : " It is manifest that the law prohibiteth the first motions of concupiscence." And Strabus, the author of the ordinary Glosse, affirmeth the same. And Ferus and Cajetan say it is sin ; yea, Thomas, 3, q. 41, ar. 1, ad. 3.

Our adversaries also piece out their justification by the distinction of venial and mortal sins, the sum whereof is—

First, that venial sin is not simply sin, but imperfectly and analogically. No transgression, but pretergression of divine law, besides it, but not against it. Some of them maintain that God is not offended with venial sin ; and they generally call such sins light, saying, that God, in justice, cannot punish them with more than a temporal punishment ; and they are pardoned without repentance, even by the outward

sprinkling of holy water, when one thinks not of them. And a man may merit the remission of these sins by the prayer of faith and other pious deeds.

Secondly, with great presumption they place many foul sins in the rank of venial, as the examples following declare.

If one in his rage and fury blaspheme God, not having had a precedent deliberate intent, he sinneth only venially. Parents cursing their children, without deliberation ; children disobeying their parents, when the same proceedeth not of contempt, but of negligence or sensuality, is venial. Scurrilous and filthy speaking, in jest only ; men's wearing of women's apparel in vanity of mind, painting of the face, &c., are venial. And drunkenness is ranked among venials by Bonaventure.

CHAPTER V

ELECTION.

SECTION 1. *King on Election and Predestination.*

PREFACE.

THERE are few subjects which have so much distracted the Church as the difficult and much disputed question of *Election*. It has given occasion to more volumes of controversy than any other debated point ; and the controversy has generally been of a more bitter character. Though it cannot be considered as one of those vital and essential doctrines, deprived of which Christianity becomes a mere dead letter, yet the disputants in this question have usually persisted in treating their opponents as absolute infidels ; as men without God, and without hope in the world ; as sciolists in learning ; and as sophists in argument. The point in dispute is this—is there, or is there not, an absolute, unconditional election of individuals to eternal life ; an election made before the foundation of the world ; irreversible in its nature, and having no other reason than the sovereign will and free mercy of God ? Are the rest of mankind, by the same absolute, irrespective, irreversible decree, prætermitted or passed over by grace, so that it is impossible for them to attain salvation ? It must be acknowledged that this is a most important and interesting question ; the opinions which we hold upon it will naturally, to a greater or less extent, influence our lives. We shall, therefore (by way of introduction to Archbishop King's able Discourse), notice the systems usually called *Calvinism* and *Arminianism* ; state some of the chief arguments by which they are supported ; and observe the difficulties which they present : and, in our notes, endeavour to ascertain what was the doctrine of Election as held by the primitive Church, and to demonstrate from the Articles that the same views are those of the Apostolic Church established in England. We shall here, then, confine our attention to the opinions actually held ; and, first, of that system which is denominated Calvinism.

The terms Calvinism and Arminianism, *as commonly understood, are very incorrect* ; but for the present we shall use them, for the sake of convenience, in their ordinary acceptation. The Calvinist, then, believes, that by virtue of a decree, passed before the foundation of the world, certain members of the human race were, by the sovereign mercy and absolute will of God, elected to eternal life ; that the rest of mankind were not so distinguished, and that they, being allowed to live and die in sin, do suffer eternal damnation. He believes, that though he elect may fall into sin, yet they cannot fall so as to lose the benefit of their election, but that by the mercy of God they will be recovered and saved ; and he instances David, Peter, and Manasseh, as cases in point. These views he supports by many passages of Scripture, of which the Archbishop's text is one of the chief. It will be observed, that the Calvinist assumes the election spoken of to be an election of individuals to everlasting life, and that the cause of this election is the sole will of God. Now it is to be observed, that although passages of Scripture are brought forward by way of proof, and reliance seems to be placed on these alone, yet *at the bottom* there is a metaphysical argument, which is the foundation of the whole system, and upon which a superstructure of scriptural reasoning is raised.

In order to understand the position of the Calvinist, we must state and explain this argument. It is this : God, he says, foreknowing necessarily all things, must foreknow who among mankind shall be saved ; but the very fact of his knowing it beforehand shows that it is not a matter of uncertainty : and because everything that shall take place in heaven and earth, at periods however distant, is all previously known to the great Ruler of all, who by his never-failing providence ordereth everything that is ; it follows that all events, and of course the ultimate fate of every particular man, is preordained by the Supreme Being. Granting this argument, all the rest follows as a matter of course ; the Calvinistic theory is already proved, and the Scriptures may be searched rather for confirmation than evidence. Calvin himself, and the boldest and most consistent of those who have assumed his name as a pledge of their opinions, openly carried out the above doctrines to their full extent. They

declared that it was impossible for the elect to miss of salvation, and that it was equally impossible for the non-elect to obtain it. They did not scruple to declare that Christ did *not* die for all mankind, but only for the elect; and they unhesitatingly denominated the decree, whereby the major part of mankind were shut out from God's favour, *a horrible decree*.* “Can we suppose (said they) that the atonement of our Lord could ever fail of its effect, or that the death of the Eternal should be in vain? Now we know that some men *will* be damned, therefore *for such* Christ did not die.” This system is perfectly consistent in itself; it is well built up, and every argument in the series is essential to the very existence of the whole: disprove one assertion, and the whole becomes inconsistent and untenable. Yet, in spite of the metaphysical argument we have adduced, it will be evident that many grave objections lie against the entire theory. We shall not now enter into the minute differences of Supralapsarian, and Sublapsarian, and Antinomian, but just point out a few of the difficulties to which the theory, in *any* shape, is liable.

It may be said, that a doctrine which, in the hands of its only consistent professors, absolutely denies the free will of man, denies also his responsibility; but as many of those who call themselves Calvinists do assert the freedom of the human will, and yet hold the other doctrines of that system, we must not argue from articles of faith which they do not acknowledge: we therefore put the argument in another form, and observe that by the *nature* of what they do believe it matters nothing to a man's salvation whether his life be correct and virtuous, or whether he be ever so profligate; for if he *be* one of the elect, he *will* certainly be saved; and if he be *not*, he *will* as certainly be damned: and this question of his ultimate destiny has been settled thousands of years before his birth. Because, also, this decree is irreversible, his conduct can have no effect upon his fate. Now this difficulty has been foreseen, and partly provided against; for though there are some who scruple not to declare that the elect may live in every kind of sin, and that grace abounds thereby, because they cannot be finally lost; yet the

* Horribile decretum.

more cautious have uniformly asserted, that the elect are not only predestined to eternal life, but also to a moral and religious life. This is certainly consistent with the rest of the scheme ; but if a man's actions in life, as well as his condition afterwards, be foreordained by a power both supreme and omnipresent, that man cannot be said to have the power of free action at all. It is but a silly quibble to say that the non-elect are free to act ill ; for as their actions must, as well as their damnation, and as well as the actions and salvation of the elect, be determined by an inevitable necessity, they are *compelled* to act as they do ; and there is no such thing as free action at all. By the same rule it may be shown that there is no such thing as free will at all ; and, as responsibility is totally dependant upon freedom, the doctrine of man's responsibility falls altogether to the ground. But there remains another objection still more weighty : God has himself declared that there is no iniquity with him, nor respect of persons. Now iniquity signifies an unevenness—a partiality in judgment ; and how can this saying of the Divine Being be reconciled with a doctrine that consigns to certain damnation more than half of the yet unborn children of men—a fate to which they are doomed by name, individually, and from which it is absolutely impossible they can escape ? At the same time, this same scheme predicates concerning the rest, that they are equally certain of salvation ; and, lest there should appear any incongruity, they shall be made righteous, and kept from fatal sins, that at last they may be received into the kingdom of heaven.

The only answer ever made to this objection, has been an attempt to silence the objector. Shall the potsherds of the earth strive against their Maker ? Shall the clay say to the potter, why hast thou made me thus ? In fine, it has been said, you have no right—indeed, it is absolute blasphemy—to say that what God has done is unjust. To which the objector may reply—I know it is ; and therefore, because what you say he *has* done is unjust, I deny that he has done it. It must not, however, be forgotten, that the answer to the objection which we have been considering may be put in another form ; and as it is more plausible in that form, it will be necessary to notice it. It is this—that, by reason of our finite nature, we are not competent

to decide as to the justice of God's doings ; so that the objection to any scheme, drawn from its appearing contrary to his justice, is, in the very nature of things, untenable, because it refers to principles which the human mind is unable to comprehend. This matter deserves a little consideration.

It pleased God to form the visible and moral universe upon a certain plan, and to rule it by certain laws ; so that it may be said that justice, and every virtue, are, as it were, inventions of the Supreme, for the use of his creatures, and for their benefit. This being the case, they must, of course, be competent to judge of these virtues wheresoever found—to trace them in the dealings of their Maker with themselves as readily as in their dealings one with another ; and although in cases where the whole of a transaction cannot be seen—and such are many of the dealings of Providence—it may be impossible for man to understand the equity of a particular dispensation ; *yet if all the circumstances connected with it were unfolded to his view, he would clearly comprehend, and readily admit, that the whole was just and upright.*

Now, in the Calvinistic scheme of Election the whole is before the mind's eye ; and when we find this whole contrary to our notions of God's justice, we have a right to object that it is not scriptural. The impartiality of the scheme is evidently not at all affected by the consideration, that men are elected to a holy life ; for it matters not, in point of justice, whether it be ordained that such an one shall be saved, or whether it be ordained that he shall live righteously and be saved ; whether it be decreed that such an one shall be damned, or whether it be decreed that he shall live wickedly and be damned : the parties are in both cases equally devoid of choice, and their conduct can partake neither of merit nor of demerit. Calvin himself declared, that as the elect were foreordained to eternal glory, so the rest of mankind were reprobated—that is, expressly decreed to eternal damnation ; that they were born for that very purpose, and by this means was the glory of God consulted. Some of Calvin's followers, though by no means the whole, deemed this a harsh saying, and instead of asserting that the major part of mankind were born for the express purpose of

being damned, they, particularly in modern times, said that the non-elect were prætermitted, or passed over by grace. When, however, we examine this, it amounts precisely to the same thing; for, as no one can repent and believe but by the grace of God, if it be predetermined that a particular person shall not have that grace bestowed upon him, it is virtually predetermined that he shall be damned: and where is the difference between creating a being for the purpose of damnation, and creating a being with a predetermination that he shall be damned? This objection seemed so forcible to the excellent, but somewhat overrated, Baxter, that he devised a scheme to get rid of it, and made an alteration in the system of Calvin, which, so modified, has been called Baxterianism. He said that it was certain that some were foreordained, individually, to eternal life, and he appears to have been led to this conclusion by the metaphysical argument which we have already noticed; but he altogether denied the doctrine of reprobation: and because Christ died for all mankind, he asserted that all men had a chance of salvation; so that of the *elect* it was determined that they *should* be saved, while of the others nothing was determined *at all*—they might, or might not, be saved. But this scheme is totally inconsistent with itself; for, in the first place, if a man who was not elect could be saved without election, election was no longer a necessary condition; and as, though a man might be able to ascertain whether he were in the favour of God, it was quite impossible for him to say whether he were *elect* or not; so his assurance of salvation rested upon faith and works, and the doctrine of Election could have no effect whatever. But it is not only thus deprived of all efficacy, but is made strangely incongruous; for it not only militates against many passages of Holy Writ, but it supposes that God, by his foreknowledge of all things, did yet leave uncertain the fate of more than half mankind; it supposes, that of two persons redeemed, one had been chosen before the foundation of the world, the other only when death had introduced him to glory. In fine, the Baxterian system not only made the doctrine of Election useless and ineffectual, but reduced it to the condition of an excrescence on the Christian dispensation.

We are reduced, then, if we wish for consistency, to take the system of Calvin, *as he delivered it himself*, or to *reject it altogether* : to deny the force of the metaphysical argument, and the application of the passages of Scripture which he adduced to favour his opinions. This has been done by some, but by very few ; and the line of argument they take, though as old as Plato, is yet almost always new, even to the highly educated. One of the noblest expositions of it is in the present discourse of Archbishop King.

We shall now turn to that system which is denominated Arminianism. The scheme which takes its denomination from Calvin *was* supported and explained by that eminent man, though it originated many centuries before him : that, however, which is called Arminianism is, in almost all respects, diametrically opposed to the opinions of Arminius. Taking, however, as before, the common acceptation, the Arminian fully asserts the freedom of the human will ; and because, according to the metaphysical argument to which we have had occasion to revert, he finds the doctrine of Individual Election is inconsistent with this, he altogether rejects it, and substitutes in its place an election of *characters*, viz., that it has been decreed, before the foundation of the world, that those who by faith and works fulfilled the conditions of the Christian dispensation, should have everlasting life ; while those who continued in unbelief were equally foreordained to damnation : on the other hand, he denies that it has been predestined of any individual either that he should be saved or damned, or that he should so live that his salvation or damnation should follow as a matter of course. This he supposes to be kept in suspense till death has sealed the character and actions of the party, and *in the interim* he is at perfect liberty to believe or not :—but as no man can believe without the grace of God assisting him, and prompting him thereto, the Arminian holds that grace is given to all men sufficient to bring them to salvation ; but that the ungodly man, instead of yielding to the influences of the Spirit, fights and strives against it, till, by long continuance in ill doing, his conscience becomes hardened, and his sins but rarely occasion him any remorse. This is, he maintains, the only scheme upon which the Scripture is made

to agree with itself, and the sacrifice of Christ can be understood as having been made for all mankind. Holding such opinions as these, he, of course, deems it possible that those who have been really in the enjoyment of God's favour, who have been spiritually-minded indeed, may yet fall away from that state, and finally make shipwreck of faith and of a good conscience, so that they sink into perdition. Such are the tenets of those *now called* Arminians.

This scheme is not without difficulties, which we shall notice, though it is evidently more simple than that of Baxter, and more agreeable to all human ideas of justice, of benevolence, and of God. The first difficulty arises from the substitution of an election of characters for an election of persons. In such passages as the text, the substitution will not hold at all; for if we say that God predestinated, called, justified, and glorified, those whom he foreknew as religious, faithful characters, that foreknowledge must still have respected persons—that is, it must have had reference to individuals. This *was* the opinion of Arminius himself, but it is totally at variance with those of the modern, so called, Arminians, who deny that the election spoken of is an election of individuals at all. The next difficulty is the much spoken of inconsistency which subsists, or has been supposed to be apparent, between the foreknowledge of God and the free will of man: this difficulty has been already noticed, and we observed that the Calvinist cuts the knot which he cannot untie; and, if he be a consistent follower of Calvin, boldly *denies* the freedom of the will. Now this the Arminian asserts, and to him, therefore, the difficulty remains.

Another attempt to avoid the dilemma has been frequently made: it was, perhaps, best expressed thus:—We acknowledge the prescience of the Almighty as a self-evident fact; we acknowledge the freedom of the human will as a revealed doctrine: these things we are not able to reconcile, but we are not to infer that they are therefore irreconcilable; it is our duty to believe them both, and if we cannot understand here their agreement, we must hope to do so when our faculties are perfected in heaven. A course of thinking so pious as this must meet our approbation, but the instance is an unfavourable one. If we

examine the two doctrines, we shall find that they lead to opposite results ; both, therefore, *in the way they are usually understood*, cannot be true ; for if we are to receive as divine truths things which have consequences directly contradictory one to the other, then we may lay aside the use of our reason altogether in religious matters, and take up the noted motto of the Roman Church—"I believe, because it is impossible." These are the objections which lie against what is called the doctrine of the Arminians. They accept, in its usual acceptation, the belief in the foreknowledge of the Deity, and this they take as a self-evident fact. We speak this guardedly, because, in its usual acceptation, as Archbishop King has admirably pointed out, the doctrine is not a true one ; and with this fallacy they join a truth, namely, the entire freedom of man's will. *Practically speaking*, there are few, if any, objections which can be brought against their tenets ; but it surely is of consequence that Christianity should be proved, not only the means of salvation, but a beautiful and consistent system of moral and mental philosophy. Such, indeed, if viewed aright, it is ; the Articles of our Church are sufficient to show this, and to them we must at last appeal, fortified as they are with the united strength of Scripture and primitive Christian tradition : the Fathers of the Church support them ; the inspired word of God confirms them ; the martyrs of Protestant times bear witness to them.

We have thus examined, first, the opinions held by the Calvinists, Arminians, and Baxterians, and pointed out the difficulties which each system presents. We have observed that they all are connected with a metaphysical argument, in reconciling which with the free will, and consequently the responsibility of man, and therefore with the equity of God, consists the task which they enjoin upon themselves—a task which, as we have endeavoured to demonstrate, is perfectly impossible. We shall show in our notes, that the early Church understood the election spoken of by St. Paul to be an election of individuals out of the world into the pale of the visible Church, and not an unconditional election to eternal salvation.

Thus, with regard to this latter tenet, it might be held, or not, though there is no evidence that it ever *was* published. If, however, any individual had thought fit, upon philosophic grounds,

to bring it forward, and to base it upon the metaphysical argument, we hardly have any data to judge from, whether he would have been condemned by the general voice of the Church or not : we incline, however, to think that the general judgment of Christians might have been expressed somewhat after this manner :—This new doctrine, though it seems to be attended with strange consequences, denies none of the fundamental doctrines of salvation, and is, in fact, rather the discussion of a metaphysical point than any new interpretation of Scripture ; yet it cannot be denied that its results seem rather unfavourable than favourable to moral excellence. We scarcely think that it would then have been considered a religious question at all ; and though it might have been attacked upon religious grounds, we think it would hardly have been denominated heresy. But this was not the way in which St. Augustine, its originator, brought it forward ; he did not assert it as a philosophical opinion, which men might accept or not, as it recommended itself to their reason, but as a theological *fact*, declared by the records of inspiration ; and to which, consequently, every judgment was obliged to bow. After all, the objections made on this account, against the Bishop of Hippo, appear not to have been raised so much against the doctrines which he taught, as because he adduced, in support of those tenets, passages of Scripture, which, as the primitive Church had already decided, applied to a totally different subject ; had he rested his belief solely on philosophical grounds, he would neither have been so strenuously opposed, nor would his sentiments have been, in these days, so much a matter of conflict. The fact seems to have been, that Augustine was convinced of the truth of his opinions by metaphysical reasoning, and that to so great an extent, as to consider it a matter of certainty that a doctrine so important must be revealed in the Scripture : those passages which speak of election seemed at once to answer the conditions he required, and accordingly he enlisted them in defence of his new doctrine. This, too, has been the course pursued by all those who have since taken the same views. We believe that there *never* has been an acute thinker among Calvinists who has not been *made a Calvinist by reasoning on the foreknowledge of God*.

In conformity to this circumstance, viz., that the early Church

decided nothing as to the doctrine of Individual Election to eternal life ; and as, in their judgment, the Scripture decided nothing ; so we shall endeavour to prove that the Articles of the Church of England decide nothing. We do not mean that nothing can be inferred either from the writings of the early Fathers, the Scriptures, or the Articles of our Apostolic Church, which shall bear upon, and even decide, this question ; but we mean that they *never entertain it as a question at all*—never directly treat upon it. It has thus been left open to the opinions of men ; but yet those who hold it, if it be incorrect, have so far an *inconsistency* in the scheme of their faith. A question, however, which has raised so much dispute—which has engaged the undivided attention of such men as Augustine, St. Thomas Aquinas, Luther, and Calvin, and which in such powerful minds has been worked out with results so widely different, cannot be uninteresting, even were it in itself a matter of small importance ; when we come, therefore, to view it as affecting the certainty, nay, in most cases, the very possibility of man's salvation, we shall hardly think that time misemployed which is spent in its investigation. The historical consideration of the doctrine escapes, but does not solve the problem ; for after we are told and convinced that the ancient Church, and the Scriptures, and the Church of England, define election to be a choosing of certain persons out of the mass of mankind into the pale of Christ's visible Church, there still recurs the difficulty—how can the foreknowledge of God be reconciled to the free will of man ? And this is what we proceed now to examine, by way of introduction to the masterly arguments of the Archbishop. We shall repeat the metaphysical argument, in order that we may have a clear view of the subject which we are to discuss. God, say the followers of Augustine, must necessarily, by virtue of his infinite perfections, be acquainted with all events, past, present, and to come ; and, among these, with the ultimate fate of every child of man. Now that which is foreknown is no longer a matter of uncertainty, and consequently the salvation or damnation of every individual is already fixed ; for if it remains a contingency, if there be any uncertainty about it, it cannot be foreknown : but the foreknowledge of God *cannot* be questioned,

therefore the fate of every individual is fixed. It follows from this, that the conduct of a man can by no means affect his ultimate destination; for his conduct must be as much foreseen, and therefore as certain, beforehand, as his salvation or damnation. Let it be granted that the righteous shall be saved and the wicked damned, yet the righteous man can no more avoid being righteous than he can being saved, which is, as we have seen, necessarily fixed from all eternity; again, the wicked man has as little power over his actions. On the other hand, it will be acknowledged, by the candid mind, that man's responsibility consists only with his perfect freedom to act well or ill; but man's responsibility is so fully insisted upon in Scripture, that there cannot remain a doubt upon the subject: we therefore infer from Scripture the freedom of the will.

How can these things be reconciled? We reply, not at all. Calvin saw this, and rejected *the freedom of the will*; Wesley saw it, and rejected the *doctrine of individual election*: the former could alone become consistent by denying the responsibility of man; the latter by denying the foreknowledge of God: neither chose to purchase consistency at such a price, and accordingly both left their systems with one flaw. It may, however, be observed, that Calvin seems sometimes to admit the non-responsibility of man, though not expressly; and that Wesley erred in supposing the election spoken of in the New Testament to be an election of *characters* to eternal life. Now if the difficulty be solved, and the foreknowledge of God shown to be consistent with the free will, and consequently with the responsibility, of man (though certainly not according to the metaphysical argument adduced by the Calvinists)—but, we say, if it be done, and that argument shown to be a fallacy, then the philosophical ground of Calvinism is gone at once. And as the passages of Scripture which they adduce were applied by the early Church, and are applied by that branch of the Apostolic Church established in England, to a kind of election not referring to eternal life at all, the whole system of Calvinism falls to the ground. The tenets of Arminius share the same fate, and the doctrine of *modern* Arminianism is shewn to be encumbered with a needless inconsistency, and vitiated by a false view of the

nature of election. We must, perforce, agree with the followers of St. Augustine, when they say that God, by virtue of his infinite perfections, must be acquainted with all events, past, present, and to come ; for this who can deny ? It is merely an assertion of God's omniscience, which is (as is rightly observed) one of his infinite perfections ; but though we are constrained to believe that the ultimate fate of every man is known to the great Supreme, yet when they tell us that that fate is *therefore* fixed, because nothing which is *foreknown* can be *uncertain*, we altogether deny the consequence. It would, indeed, be perfectly correct were the assertion made of a finite creature, but when made of the eternal and self-existing Deity it is by no means a necessary result. As this is clearly proved by the Archbishop, we shall endeavour to show, that to God *everything is known*, but *nothing is foreknown* ; that, in fact, there is to him *neither past nor future*, but that, in the words of one of our philosophical poets, "he sees before him one immortal now !" This, we acknowledge, is a conception difficult to comprehend—impossible perfectly to realize ; but it is one which is not unintelligible : it may be so far brought within the grasp of our reason, that if we do not see *the means* whereby *it is*—*the mode* wherein it exists—we may yet be convinced of its *possibility*, and this is all that is necessary. We are perfectly aware that God is everywhere present, and this idea we realize by having recourse to infinity ; and thus, conceiving him to be a spiritual essence, pervading all space and ruling all creation, we are also aware, though we find more difficulty in bringing the conception in an intelligible form before our minds, that the Deity must have *been from* everlasting, and that he is self-existent. This is more difficult to realize, because the relations of space are generally more easily embraced by the intellect than those of duration : still we can so far understand the fact, that it offers no stumbling-block to our reason. Now we never think of extending these attributes to man ; we at once perceive that he *had* a beginning, and that he can exist *but in one portion of space at a time* ; yet though man cannot do this, it would be acknowledged impious to say that the Supreme Being labours under the same incapacity. Let us extend these just and reverend ideas to the relations of duration :

let us acknowledge that God fills *all time* with his being, as well as *all space* with his presence : let us admit, that to Him the past and the future are alike present—as, indeed, to the Self-existent, who has from all eternity been the same, must necessarily be the case *—and we shall find the foreknowledge of God will assume quite another aspect ; it will be no longer foreknowledge, but simply knowledge, the being acquainted with that which *is*. Thus, then, we see that the circumstance of our ultimate destiny being known to the Almighty does not at all make that fate less an undecided, undetermined matter. He sees that which *to us* is *future*, because to *him* it is *present* : he perceives it because *it is*, but it *is* not in *consequence of his seeing it* that it is.

The events of all ages are mirrored in the mind of the Eternal God—the transactions of the most remote future as well as of the earliest periods—simply because his supreme existence knows *no difference of time*, but subsists at one and the same time in the solitary grandeur in which he was before creation, and in that ineffable glory which shall burst on the eyes of the Christian when heaven and earth shall have passed away. In a word, the whole of his existence, which had no beginning, and which can have no termination, is ever present to him ; not by way of recollection or of anticipation, but actually present by virtue of his infinite attributes. Thus we see, that because any event may be said to be future to us, it is not therefore future to Him who made us ; and though the certain knowledge of any future event, *if possessed by a finite creature*, would of itself render that event certain, it is not so in the case of the Deity.

* This argument may be expressed thus :—As God existed from all eternity, if he existed by periods of duration, then every moment of his existence must have been successively future, present, and past ; but it cannot be said of a period *infinitely* distant in the past, that it ever was present, much less future ; for if so, then there was a period previous to it : and thus we have degrees in infinity, and one period more infinitely distant than another, which is an absurdity, a contradiction in terms ; consequently we must admit that the Divine Being does not, like his finite creatures, exist by periods of duration, but that all times are alike present to him.

We see the image of the ship reflected in the glassy surface of the summer sea; we observe, that while she walks the waters like a thing of life, the reflection ever follows her: yet who would say that the ship's progress is caused by the motion of the shadow? We behold, reflected in a mirror, our own countenances, and, if we please, our own actions; yet we never imagine those actions, or those peculiarities of countenance, to be caused by the mirror. We gaze on the stars as they send us back a reflected lustre from the smooth face of the midnight lake, we note the slow and majestic motion of the moon as she paths her way from star to star; but we should esteem that man mad indeed who would assert the motions of the luminary to be caused by those of the mirrored image. These things are reflected because they are—they do not exist in *consequence of* their reflection. Now let us apply this same theory to the divine omniscience; let us recollect, that if the future be indeed actually and not figuratively present to the mind of the Supreme, that its actions and events are likewise as actually present—present in all their tangible reality—present in all their independence of volition; the doers free to change and repent—free to sin and to fall—free to believe and be saved. Their deeds and their thoughts are visible in the awful mirror of that eye; though, perchance, a thousand years may roll over the heads of mortals before they are transacted on earth. He acknowledges no variation of date, to whom a thousand years are as one day, and one day as a thousand years. The fearful scenes of the judgment are even now before Him: the righteous already saved, the wicked already damned. With regard to Him, Abraham is a contemporary with the spirit but just ransomed, and with the last soul that shall be gathered out of the nations of the world into the fold of Christ. We, then, are entitled to say, that the *event itself* is the *cause of God's knowing it*, not the *foreknowledge of God* the *cause of any event*. The election of the faithful is caused by their actual faith and works, not *foreseen*, but *actually performed*; and the damnation of the wicked is the consequence of their own guilt—*guilt* which they *might* have avoided, which they were *urged* to avoid, and in

committing which they had continually to stifle the pleadings of restraining grace.

Thus it is, then, that the events of future ages, the actions of yet unborn men, are before Him, *because* they take place; and whom he doth foreknow—that is, behold in this reflection walking in his ways, which he doth set before him—they doth he also predestinate. Nor let it be supposed that we thus cut short any of the divine attributes, when we deny that anything can be, in *our sense of the word*, *foreseen* by the Supreme. We assert, that he knoweth all things; but as all things take place according to his most righteous government, he must of necessity know that which he does or permits to be done; whereas if we imagine that the Deity foresees the future, as *future to himself*, we must, by admitting that all things, all events, small and great, are decided by that foreknowledge, strip God of his power, and make Him, as well as man, a mere *creature of necessity*. Now when the sacred writers, speaking of God, say, “God is not a man that he should lie, nor the son of man that he should repent,” we are to understand this as implying, that God’s determinations were not to be influenced *like those of man*; but that the divine pleasure *has* been repeatedly changed, concerning particular objects, we have the authority of the Scriptures themselves for asserting. He resolved, for the wickedness of the people, to destroy the city of Nineveh; but when they repented, even though he had especially commissioned a prophet to denounce his judgments against them, he mercifully gave them further time, and delayed carrying into execution the judgment of vengeance.

The question here occurs, did God *intend* to destroy Nineveh when he sent Jonah? Undoubtedly *he did*, for otherwise we must suppose that he sent a prophet in his name to prophecy a lie; and if even we are told, that the object of the falsehood was to drive the people of Nineveh, by terror, to repentance, we dare not for a moment suppose so monstrous an inconsistency. God, therefore, *intending* to destroy Nineveh, was moved, by the repentance of the guilty people, to exercise his favourite attribute, and pardon them. This is by no means a solitary case;

we will adduce a few similar instances. Hezekiah was sick, and the sacred narrative proceeds thus—"And the prophet Isaiah, the son of Amos, came unto him and said, Thus saith the Lord, set thine house in order, for thou shalt die and not live." Hezekiah, however, turned his face to the wall, and poured forth an earnest prayer to the Lord, that his life might be spared. "And it came to pass, that before Isaiah was gone out into the middle court, that the word of the Lord came unto him, saying, Turn again, and tell Hezekiah, the captain of my people, Thus saith the Lord, the God of David, thy father: I have heard thy prayer, I have seen thy tears; behold I will heal thee: on the third day thou shalt go up to the house of the Lord, and I will add unto thy days fifteen years." This is, perhaps, the most remarkable answer to prayer recorded in the Scriptures; the cause of the prayer, and the benignity of God's answer is evident, though it is too generally overlooked. We are not to suppose that Hezekiah, though he had probably committed some sin, for which the awful sentence was pronounced, of which Isaiah was but the messenger—we can hardly, we say, suppose that this pious monarch looked with a pusillanimous terror on the approach of death; but had he died *then*, he would have died *childless*: and this, which was, under any circumstances, considered a curse among the Jews, was doubly so to a descendant of David, and a king of Israel.

Once more, a heavy curse was denounced against Ahab, but Ahab humbled himself before God, and the execution of the curse was delayed till another generation. "I will not bring the evil in his days; but in his son's days will I bring the evil upon his house." Many more such cases might be adduced, but these three will be enough; and we shall be entitled to say, from these instances, that in the case of Nineveh, in that of Hezekiah, and in that of Ahab, there was *no* irreversible decree gone forth concerning them *at all*. For where is the man who will tell us that Jonah, Elijah, and Isaiah, were sent by the God of truth to prophecy in his name a lie, and a lie too which would bring with it its own refutation, and hand it down to all posterity? If, then, we agree that *no irreversible* decree had been ordained concerning this mighty

city and these two princes, we must at once give up the idea that any such decree is, or ever has been, passed concerning *any person or event at all*. For the argument of the predestinarian supposes, that *because* God foresees an event, it *must* of necessity come to pass, and nothing can change it; but as he foresees all things, and all motives, so everything takes place according to the irreversible decree passed before the foundation of the world: but if it be proved that there are events not so decreed, then the whole argument must fall, because it would imply that those events were *not foreseen* by the Lord; and thus, according to the predestinarian, he would not be omniscient. We therefore ask the question, what *was* decreed in the instances we have taken? or rather put the case in this way—either it was ordained, from all eternity, that Nineveh should be destroyed, that Hezekiah should die, and that the curse should be fulfilled upon Ahab at the times peculiarly predicted by Jonah, Isaiah, and Elijah, or that they should not. If that they *should*, then the decree was reversed; for Nineveh was *not* then destroyed, Hezekiah did *not* then die, *nor* was the curse then executed upon Ahab. If that they should *not*, then God, having previously determined otherwise, sent three distinguished prophets to declare in his name a falsehood. The only way of avoiding the frightful, nay, the blasphemous alternative, is to suppose that no decree about them was passed at all; but that God in all cases leaves his creatures quite free, and, consequently, entirely responsible.

The doctrine which we have advanced concerning the infinite perfection of the Almighty, and his consequent elevation above the conditions of duration and space, is no new one. It is shadowed forth in that glorious name, “I AM,” whereby he chose to be known among the Israelites of old. It is again alluded to by our Lord in the remarkable words, “Before Abraham was, I am.” As God, the infinite period of his existence, past, present, and future, lay ever before him; and there was no more perfect manner of announcing his Deity than by these simple words. Such has been the opinion of the wise in all ages. It was derived from tradition, but preserved from corruption; and though a doctrine

too abstruse for the multitude, and therefore, because *not necessary to salvation*, passed over without *express* discussion by the inspired writers, there were ever some to whom it *was* familiar. Even among the Gentiles it was not altogether lost. This august truth found a fit dwelling-place in the mind of Plato, a man who possessed, perhaps, the most magnificent intellect ever bestowed upon mortal. He thus expresses himself on the nature of God: "God is that which was, is, and shall be; yet of him we should only say, He is." This is but putting in another form the most sublime name of the Eternal, "I AM." The same doctrine has been taught by Dante, by St. Thomas Aquinas, by Sir Thomas Brown, and by Archbishop King.

We have spoken of it as an abstruse doctrine, and so it is; a doctrine *too* abstruse for the multitude, and one *not* necessary to salvation. This is, we apprehend, the reason that it is not formally enunciated in the book of the divine oracles; but that it is there implied, we have, we trust, satisfactorily shown. If it be asked, what is the *utility* of bringing forward a doctrine which is allowed to be of a nature too recondite, even when ever so ably explained and elucidated, for the majority to comprehend? we reply, that there is much danger in *those doctrines* to which it is the *only* antidote; that we may be, and we doubt not shall be, understood by many; and to the rest we can only say, they believe that which is told them by astronomers respecting the distances and magnitudes of the heavenly bodies, and they do not listen to any pretender who might tell them to the contrary; and this, although their want of mathematical learning incapacitates them from ascertaining which is right and which is wrong. What we entreat of them is, to do the same in this momentous question; and if their minds are ever troubled by those questions of predestination and foreknowledge, to which we have alluded, to remember that the omniscience of God, and the free will of man, and his consequent responsibility, do not clash one with the other, but offer a reciprocal support. If they find the question too abstruse, let them dismiss it, but remember that it has been solved, and take to their comfort the solution. There is no decree by which they are preordained to destruction; their salvation

depends on their faith, and while the lamp of their life continues to burn, it will be undecided. Grace is given to all, and if we resist it not, if we pray and watch, it will bring us to God through Christ. Those only are cast out who do not knock, who refuse to ask.

C.

CAMBRIDGE,
The Feast of St. Mark the Evangelist.

A DISCOURSE ON PREDESTINATION.

BY

THE MOST REV WILLIAM KING, D.D.,

LORD ARCHBISHOP OF DUBLIN.

ROMANS viii. 29, 30.

For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the first-born among many brethren. Moreover, whom he did predestinate, them he also called; and whom he called, them he also justified; and whom he justified, them he also glorified.

IN these words the apostle lays down the several steps by which God proceeds in the saving of his elect. First, he knows and considers those whom he designs for salvation; secondly, he decrees and predestinates them to be like his Son Jesus Christ, in holiness here, and glory hereafter, that he might be the first-born among many brethren; thirdly, he calls them to the means of salvation; fourthly, he justifies; and, lastly, he glorifies them. This is the chain and series of God's dealing with his beloved, in which he is represented to us as first designing, and then executing, his gracious purposes towards them.

I am very sensible that great contentions and divisions have happened in the Church of God about predestination and reprobation, about election and the decrees of God; that learned men have engaged with the greatest zeal and fierceness in this controversy, and the disputes have proved so intricate, that the most diligent reader will, perhaps, after all his labour in perusing them, be but little satisfied, and less edified, by the greatest part of all that has been written upon this subject. And hence it is that considerate men of all parties seem at last, as it were by consent, to have laid it aside; and seldom any now venture to bring it into the pulpit, except some very young or imprudent preachers.

Not but that the doctrine laid down in my text is undoubtedly true and useful, if we could but light on the true and useful way of treating it; for so our Church has told us in her seventeenth

Article, where she informs us, “that as the godly consideration of predestination is full of sweet, pleasant, and unspeakable comfort to godly persons, so for curious and carnal persons, lacking the Spirit of Christ, to have continually before their eyes the sentence of God’s predestination, is a most dangerous downfall, whereby the devil doth thrust them either into desperation, or into wretchedness of most unclean living.”

The case, therefore, being thus, I shall endeavour to lay before you that which I take to be the edifying part of the doctrine of Predestination, and in such a manner, I hope, as to avoid everything that may give occasion to ignorant or corrupt men to make an ill use of it.

In order to this, I shall—

First, consider the representation that the text gives of God, as contriving our salvation ; and shall endeavour to explain how these terms of foreknowing and predestinating are to be understood when attributed to God.

Secondly, why the holy Scriptures represent God to us after this manner.

Thirdly, what use we are to make of this doctrine of God’s foreseeing, freely electing, and predestinating men to salvation.

As to the first of these, you may observe, that in the representation here given of God’s dealing, there are five acts ascribed to him—*foreknowing, predestinating, calling, justifying, and glorifying* : and about each of these, great disputes have arisen among divines, and parties and sects have been formed on the different opinions concerning them. However, as to the three last, Protestants seem now pretty well agreed ; but as to the two first, the difference is so great, that on account thereof there yet remain formed and separate parties, that mutually refuse to communicate with one another : though I believe, if the differences between them were duly examined and stated, they would not appear to be so great as they seem to be at first view ; nor consequently would there appear any just reason for those animosities that yet remain between the contending parties.

In order to make this evident, we may consider—

I. That it is in effect agreed, on all hands, that the nature of God, as it is in itself, is incomprehensible by human understanding ; and not only his nature, but likewise his powers and faculties, and the ways and methods in which he exercises them, are so far beyond our reach, that we are utterly incapable of framing exact and adequate notions of them. Thus the Scriptures frequently teach us, particularly St. Paul in his Epistle to the Romans, chap. xi. 33 : “O the depth of the riches both of

the wisdom and knowledge of God ! How unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out !” Ver. 34 : “For who hath known the mind of the Lord, or who hath been his counsellor ?”

2. We ought to remember that the descriptions which we frame to ourselves of God, or of the divine attributes, are not taken from any direct or immediate perceptions that we have of him or them, but from some observations we have made of his works, and from the consideration of those qualifications that we conceive would enable us to perform the like. Thus observing great order, conveniency, and harmony in all the several parts of the world, and perceiving that everything is adapted, and tends to the preservation and advantage of the whole, we are apt to consider that we could not contrive and settle things in so excellent and proper a manner without great wisdom ; and thence conclude that God, who has thus concerted and settled matters, must have wisdom : and having, then, ascribed to him wisdom, because we see the effects and result of it in his works, we proceed, and conclude that he has likewise foresight and understanding, because we cannot conceive wisdom without these, and because, if we were to do what we see he has done, we could not expect to perform it without the exercise of these faculties.

And it doth truly follow from hence, that God must either have these, or other faculties and powers equivalent to them, and adequate to these mighty effects which proceed from them. And because we do not know what his faculties are in themselves, we give them the names of those powers that we find would be necessary to us in order to produce such effects, and call them wisdom, understanding, and foreknowledge ; but at the same time we cannot but be sensible that they are of a nature altogether different from ours, and that we have no direct or proper notion or conception of them. Only we are sure that they have effects like unto those that do proceed from wisdom, understanding, and foreknowledge in us ; and when our works fail to resemble them in any particular, as to perfection, it is by reason of some want or defect in these qualifications.

Thus our reason teaches us to ascribe these attributes to God, by way of resemblance and analogy to such qualities or powers as we find most valuable and perfect in ourselves.

3. If we look into the holy Scriptures, and consider the representations given us there of God or his attributes, we shall find them generally of the same nature, and plainly borrowed from some resemblance to things with which we are acquainted by our senses. Thus, when the holy Scriptures speak of God,

they ascribe hands, and eyes, and feet to him: not that it is designed that we should believe that he has any of these members according to the literal signification; but the meaning is, that he has a power to execute all those acts, to the effecting of which these parts in us are instrumental: that is, he can converse with men as well as if he had a tongue and mouth; he can discern all that we do or say as perfectly as if he had eyes and ears; he can reach us as well as if he had hands and feet; he has as true and substantial a being as if he had a body; and he is as truly present everywhere as if that body were infinitely extended. And in truth, if all these things, which are thus ascribed to him, did really and literally belong to him, he could not do what he does near so effectually, as we conceive and are sure he doth them by the faculties and properties which he really possesses, though what they are in themselves be unknown to us.

After the same manner, and for the same reason, we find him represented as affected with such passions as we perceive to be in ourselves, viz., as angry and pleased, as loving and hating, as repenting and changing his resolutions, as full of mercy and provoked to revenge; and yet, on reflection, we cannot think that any of these passions can literally affect the divine nature. But the meaning confessedly is, that he will as certainly punish the wicked as if he were inflamed with the passion of anger against them; that he will as infallibly reward the good as we will those for whom we have a particular and affectionate love; that when men turn from their wickedness, and do what is agreeable to the divine command, he will as surely change his dispensations towards them, as if he really repented and had changed his mind.

And as the nature and passions of men are thus, by analogy and comparison, ascribed to God, because these would in us be the principles of such outward actions as we see he has performed, if we were the authors of them; so in the same manner, and by the same condescension to the weakness of our capacities, we find the powers and operations of our mind ascribed unto him.

As for example, it is the part of a wise man to consider beforehand what is proper for him to do, to prescribe means and methods to obtain his ends, to lay down some scheme or plan of his work before he begins, and to keep resolutely to it in the execution; for if he should be conceived to deviate in anything from his first purpose, it would argue some imperfection in laying the design, or want of power to execute it. And therefore it is after this manner the Scripture represents God,

as purposing and contriving beforehand all his works; and for this reason, wisdom, and understanding, and counsel, and foreknowledge, are ascribed to him: because both reason and Scripture assure us, that we ought to conceive of God as having all the perfection that we perceive to be in these attributes, and that he has all the advantages that these powers or faculties could give him.

The advantages that understanding and knowledge give a man in the use of them, are to enable him to order his matters with conveniency to himself and consistency in his works, so that they may not hinder or embarrass one another. And inasmuch as all the works of God are so ordered that they have the greatest congruity in themselves, and are most excellently adapted to their several uses and ends, we are sure there is a power in God who orders them equivalent to knowledge and understanding; and because we know not what it is in itself, we give it these names.

Lastly, the use of foreknowledge with us is to prevent any surprise when events happen, and that we may not be at a loss what to do by things coming upon us unawares. Now inasmuch as we are certain that nothing can surprise God, and that he can never be at a loss what to do in any event, therefore we conclude that God has a faculty to which our foreknowledge bears some analogy, and therefore we call it by that name.

But it does not follow from hence that any of these are more properly and literally in God, after the manner that they are in us, than hands or eyes, than mercy, love, or hatred are; but, on the contrary, we must acknowledge that those things which we call by these names, when attributed to God, are of so very different a nature from what they are in us, and so superior to all that we can conceive, that in reality there is no more likeness between them than between our hand and God's power; nor can we draw consequences from the real nature of one to that of the other with more justness of reason than we can conclude, because our hand consists of fingers and joints, that the power of God is distinguished by such parts.

And therefore to argue, because foreknowledge, as it is in us, if supposed infallible, cannot consist with the contingency of events, that therefore what we call so in God cannot, is as far from reason as it would be to conclude, because our eyes cannot see in the dark, that therefore, when God is said to see all things, his eyes must be enlightened with a perpetual sunshine; or because we cannot love or hate without passion, that therefore, when the Scriptures ascribe these to God, they teach us that he is liable to these affections as we are.

We ought, therefore, to interpret all these things, when attributed to God, as thus expressed only by way of condescension to our capacities, in order to help us to conceive what we are to expect from him, and what duty we are to pay to him; and particularly that the terms of foreknowledge, predestination, nay, of understanding and will, when ascribed to him, are not to be taken strictly or properly, nor are we to think that they are in him after the same manner, or in the same sense, that we find them in ourselves; but, on the contrary, we are to interpret them only by way of analogy or comparison.

That is to say, when we ascribe foreknowledge to him, we mean that he can no more be surprised with anything that happens, than a wise man, that foresees an event, can be surprised when it comes to pass: nor can he any more be at a loss what he is to do in such a case, than a wise man can who is most perfectly acquainted with all accidents which may obstruct his design, and has provided against them.

So when God is said to predetermine and foreordain all things according to the counsel of his will, the importance of this expression is, that all things depend as much on God as if he had settled them according to a certain scheme and design which he had voluntarily framed in his own mind, without regard had to any other consideration besides that of his own mere will and pleasure.

If, then, we understand predetermination and predestination in this analogous sense, to give us a notion of the irresistible power of God, and of that supreme dominion he may exercise over his creatures, it will help us to understand what the sovereignty is that God has over us, the submission that we ought to pay him, and the dependence we have upon him.

But it no ways follows from hence that this is inconsistent with the contingency of events, or free will. And from hence it appears what it is that makes us apt to think so: which is only this, that we find in ourselves, when we determine to do a thing, and are able to do what we have resolved on, that thing cannot be contingent to us: and if God's foreknowledge and predetermination were of the same nature with ours, the same inconsistency would be justly inferred. But I have already shewed that they are not of the same kind, and that they are only ascribed to him by way of analogy and comparison, as love and mercy, and other passions are; that they are quite of another nature, and that we have no proper notion of them, any more than a man born blind has of sight and colours; and therefore that we ought no more to pretend to determine what is consistent or not consistent with them, than a blind man

ought to determine, from what he hears or feels, to what objects the sense of seeing reaches: for this were to reason from things that are only comparatively and improperly ascribed to God, and by way of analogy and accommodation to our capacities, as if they were properly and univocally the same in him and in us.

If we would speak the truth, those powers, properties, and operations, the names of which we transfer to God, are but faint shadows and resemblances, or rather, indeed, emblems and parabolical figures of the divine attributes, which they are designed to signify; whereas his attributes are the originals, the true real things of a nature so infinitely superior and different from anything we discern in his creatures, or that can be conceived by finite understandings, that we cannot with reason pretend to make any other deductions from the natures of one to that of the others than those he has allowed us to make, or extend the parallel any further than that very instance which the resemblance was designed to teach us.

Thus foreknowledge and predestination, when attributed to God, are designed to teach us the obligations which we owe to him for our salvation, and the dependence we have on his favour; and so far we may use and press them: but to conclude from thence that these are inconsistent with free will, is to suppose that they are the same in him and us; and just as reasonable as to infer, because wisdom is compared in Scripture to a tree of life, that therefore it grows in the earth, has its spring and fall, and is warmed by the sun and fed by the rain.

II. And this brings me to the second head which I proposed to myself in this discourse, which was to shew you why God and heavenly things are after this manner represented to us in holy Scripture. And the first reason that I shall offer is, that we must either be content to know them this way, or not at all. I have already told you, and I believe every considering man is convinced, that the nature and perfections of God, as he is in himself, are such that it is impossible we should comprehend them, especially in the present state of imperfection, ignorance, and corruption in which this world lies. He is the object of none of our senses, by which we receive all our direct and immediate perception of things; and therefore, if we know any thing of him at all, it must be by deductions of reason, by analogy and comparison, by resembling him to something that we do know and are acquainted with.

It is by this way we arrive at the most noble and useful notions we have, and by this method we teach and instruct others. Thus, when we would help a man to some conception of any thing that has not fallen within the reach of his senses, we do

it by comparing it to something that already has, by offering him some similitude, resemblance, or analogy, to help his conception. As for example, to give a man a notion of a country to which he is a stranger, and to make him apprehend its bounds and situation, we produce a map to him, and by that he obtains as much knowledge of it as serves him for his present purpose. Now a map is only paper and ink, diversified with several strokes and lines, which in themselves have very little likeness to earth, mountains, valleys, lakes, and rivers; yet none can deny but, by proportion and analogy, they are very instructive: and if any should imagine that these countries are really paper, because the maps that represent them are made of it, and should seriously draw conclusions from that supposition, he would expose his understanding, and make himself ridiculous: and yet such as argue from the faint resemblances that either Scripture or reason give of the divine attributes and operations, and proceed in their reasonings as if these must in all respects answer one another, fall into the same absurdities that those would be guilty of who should think countries must be of paper, because the maps that represent them are so.

To apply this more particularly to the case before us. We ascribe decrees and predestination to God, because the things signified by these words bear some resemblance to certain perfections that we believe to be in him. But if we remember that they are only similitudes and representations of them, and that there is as little likeness between the one and the other as between the countries and maps which represent them; and that the likeness lies not in the nature of them, but in some particular effect or circumstance that is in some measure common to both; we must acknowledge it very unreasonable to expect that they should answer one another in all things: or because the different representations of the same thing cannot be exactly adjusted in every particular, that therefore the thing represented is inconsistent in itself.

Foreknowledge and decrees are only assigned to God to give us a notion of the steadiness and certainty of the divine actions; and, if so, for us to conclude that what is represented by them is inconsistent with the contingency of events or free will, because the things representing (I mean, our foreknowledge and decrees) are so, is the same absurdity as it is to conclude that China is no bigger than a sheet of paper, because the map that represents it is contained in that compass.

This seems to me a material point, and therefore I will endeavour to illustrate with an instance or two more. Everybody is satisfied that time, motion, and velocity, are subjects of very

useful knowledge; and that adjusting and discovering the proportions that these bear to one another is, perhaps, all that is profitable in natural philosophy. How is it, then, that we proceed in our demonstrations concerning these? Is it not by representing them by a line, the degrees of velocity by another, and the motion that results from both by a superficies or a solid?—and from these we draw conclusions, which are not only very true, but also of great moment to arts and sciences; and never fail in our deductions, while we keep justly to the analogy and proportion they bear to one another in the production of natural effects; neither is it easy, nor perhaps possible, to come at such knowledge any other way.

Yet, in the nature of the thing, there is no great similitude between a line and time; and it will not be very obvious to a person, who is not acquainted with the method of the skilful in such matters, to conceive how a solid should answer the compounded effect of time and motion. But if any, instead of endeavouring to understand the method and proportions used by the learned in such cases, in order to discover to them these useful truths, should reject the whole as a thing impossible, alleging that we make time a permanent thing and existing altogether, because a line which represents it in this scheme is so, we should think that he hardly deserved an answer to such a foolish objection.

And yet of this nature are most, if not all, the objections that are commonly made against the representations that the Scripture gives us of the divine nature, and of the mysteries of our religion.

Thus the holy Scriptures represent to us that distinction which we are obliged to believe to be in the unity of God, by that of three persons, and the relation they bear to one another by that of a father to his son, and of a man to his spirit; and those that object against this, and infer that these must be three substances, because three persons among men are so, do plainly forget that these are but representations and resemblances, and fall into the same absurd way of reasoning that the former do, who conclude that we make time a permanent thing because a line is so by which we represent it.

Again, if we were to describe to an ignorant American what was meant by writing, and told him that it is a way of making words visible and permanent, so that persons at any distance of time and place may be able to see and understand them; the description would seem very strange to him, and he might object that the thing must be impossible, for words are not to be seen, but heard: they pass in the speaking, and it is impossible

they should affect the absent, much less those that live in distant ages. To which there needs no other answer than to inform him that there are other sorts of words beside those he knows, that are truly called so, because equivalent to such as are spoken; that they have both the same use, and serve equally to communicate our thoughts to one another; and that if he will but have patience, and apply himself to learn, he will soon understand, and be convinced of the possibility and usefulness of the thing: and none can doubt but he were much to blame, and acted an unwise part, if he refused to believe the person that offered to instruct him, or neglected to make the experiment.

And sure when any one objects against the possibility of the Three Persons of the Trinity in one God, it is every whit as good an answer to tell such an objector that there are other sort of persons besides those we see among men, whose personality is as truly different from what we call so, as a word written is different from a word spoken, and yet equivalent to it. And though three persons, such as men are, cannot be in one human nature, as a word spoken cannot be visible and permanent; yet what we call three persons by comparison and analogy, may consist in the unity of the Godhead.

And after the same manner we ought to answer those who object against the foreknowledge and decrees of God as inconsistent with the freedom of choice, by telling them, that though such foreknowledge and decrees as are in our understanding and wills cannot consist with contingency, if we suppose them certain; yet what we call so in God may, being quite of a different nature, and only called by those names by reason of some analogy and proportion which is between them.

And if men will but have patience, and wait the proper time, when faith shall be perfected into vision, and we shall know even as we are known, they may then see, and be as well satisfied, that there is no absurdity in the trinity of persons, or foreknowledge of contingency, as the Indian is, when he has learned to read and write, that there is no impossibility in visible permanent words.

Lastly, it is observable, that no care, industry, or instruction, can ever give a person born, and continuing blind, any notion of light; nor can he ever have any conception how men who have eyes discern the shape and figure at a distance, nor imagine what colours mean: and yet he would, I believe, readily (on the account he receives from others of the advantage of knowing these things) endure labour and pain, and submit to the most difficult and tormenting operations of physic and chirur-

gery, in order to obtain the use of his eyes, if any reasonable hope could be given him of the success of such an undertaking. And why, then, should not we as willingly submit to those easy methods which God has prescribed to us, in order to obtain that knowledge of his nature and attributes in which our eternal satisfaction and happiness hereafter is in a very great measure to consist? And it is certain we now know as much of them as the blind man, in the case supposed, does of light or colours; and have better reason to seek, and more certain hope of attaining in the next life to a fuller and more complete knowledge, than such a man can have with relation to the use of his eyes, and the advantage of seeing. And then will he not rise up in judgment against us, and condemn us? Since he endures so much to obtain sight on the imperfect representations of it made to him by other men, whilst we will not believe and endure as much for eternal happiness, on the testimony of God.

If it be asked, why these things are not made clear to us? I answer, for the same reason that light and colours are not clear to one that is born blind, even because in this imperfect state we want faculties to discern them: and we cannot expect to reach the knowledge of them whilst here, for the same reason that a child, whilst he is so, cannot speak and discourse as he doth when a grown man;—there is a time and season for everything, and we must wait for that season. There is another state and life for the clear discerning of these matters; but in the mean time we ought to take the steps and methods which are proper for our condition: and if we will not do so, we can no more expect to arrive to the knowledge of these necessary truths, or that state which will make them plain to us, than a child can hope he shall ever be able to read and write who will not be persuaded to go to school, or obey his master.

This analogical knowledge of God's nature and attributes is all of which we are capable at present; and we must either be contented to know him thus, or sit down with an entire ignorance and neglect of God, and finally despair of future happiness. But it concerns us frequently to call to mind the apostle's observation (1 Cor. xiii. 12): "For now we see through a glass darkly, but then face to face; now I know in part, but then I shall know even as I am known." Though our present knowledge of divine things be very imperfect, yet it is enough to awaken our desire of more; and though we do not understand the enjoyments of the blessed, yet the description we have of them is sufficient to engage us to seek after them, and to prosecute the methods prescribed in Scripture for attaining them.

And therefore let me offer it as a second reason why God

and divine things are thus represented to us in Scripture, viz., that such knowledge is sufficient to all the intents and purposes of religion; the design whereof is to lead us in the way of eternal happiness, and, in order thereunto, to teach and oblige us to live reasonably, to perform our duty to God, our neighbours, and ourselves, to conquer and mortify our passions and lusts, to make us beneficent and charitable to men, and to oblige us to love, obey, and depend upon God.

Now it is easy to shew that such a knowledge as I have described is sufficient to obtain all these ends; for though I know not what God is in himself, yet if I believe he is able to hurt or help me, to make me happy or miserable, this belief is sufficient to convince me that it is my duty to fear him. If I be assured that all his works are done with regularity, order, and fitness; that nothing can surprise or disappoint him; that he can never be in any doubt, or at a loss what is proper for him to do; though I do not comprehend the faculties by which he performs so many admirable and amazing things, yet I know enough to make me adore and admire his conduct. If I be satisfied that I can no more expect to escape free, when I break the laws and rules he has prescribed me, than a subject can who assaults his prince in the midst of all his guards; this is enough to make me cautious about every word I speak and every action I perform, and to put me out of all hope of escaping when I offend him.

If I am convinced that God will be as steady to the rules he has prescribed for my deportment as a wise and just prince will be to his laws, this alone will oblige me to a strict observance of the divine commands, and assure me that I must be judged according as I have kept or transgressed them.

If a man be convinced that by his sins he has forfeited all right and title to happiness, and that God is under no obligation to grant him pardon for them; that only the free mercy of God can put him into the way of salvation; and that he may as well, without imputation of injustice, pardon one, and pass by another, as a prince may, of many equal malefactors, reprieve one for an instance of his mercy and power, and suffer the rest to be carried to execution,—if a man, I say, find himself under these circumstances, he will have the same obligations of gratitude to his God that the pardoned offender owes to his prince, and impute his escape entirely to the peculiar favour of God, that made the distinction between him and others without any regard to their merits.

If we believe that there is a distinction in the manner of the subsisting of the divine nature that requires such particular

applications from us to God as we pay to three distinct persons here, and that he has such distinct and really different relations to himself, and to us on this account, as three men have to one another, that is enough to oblige us to pay our addresses to him as thus distinguished, and to expect as different benefits and blessings from him, under this distinction, as we expect from different persons here : and it can be no hindrance to our duty that we are ignorant of the nature and manner of that distinction.

Let us consider how many honour and obey their prince who never saw him, who never had any personal knowledge of him, and could not distinguish him from another man if they should meet him. This will shew us that it is not necessary that we should personally know our governor, to oblige us to perform our duty to him ; and if many perform their duty to their prince without knowing him, why should it seem strange that we should be obliged to do our duty to God, though we do not know any more of his person or nature but that he is our Creator and Governor ?

Lastly, to shew that this kind of knowledge is sufficient for salvation, let us suppose one who takes all the descriptions we have of God literally, who imagines him to be a mighty King that sits in heaven, and has the earth for his footstool ; that at the same time hath all things in his view which can happen ; that has thousands and thousands of ministers to attend him, all ready to obey and execute his commands ; that has a great love and favour for such as diligently obey his orders, and is in a rage and fury against the disobedient : could any one doubt but he, who in the simplicity of his heart should believe these things, as literally represented, would be saved by virtue of that belief, or that he would not have motives strong enough to oblige him to love, honour, and obey God ?

If it should be objected that such representations do not exactly answer the nature of things, I confess this is true ; but I would desire you to consider, that the best representations we can make of God are infinitely short of the truth, and that the imperfections of such representations will never be imputed to us as a fault, provided we do not wilfully dishonour him by unworthy notions ; and our conceptions of him be such as may sufficiently oblige us to perform the duties he requires at our hands.

And if any one farther allege, that he who takes these representations literally will be involved in many difficulties, and that it will be easy to shew that there are great inconsistencies in them, if we understand them according to the letter—

I answer, he is to be looked upon as very officious and im-

pertinent that will raise such objections, and put them in the heads of plain, honest people, who, by the force of such common though figurative knowledge (as it may be termed), practise the substantial and real duties of religion, that lead them to eternal happiness.

It is true, when curious and busy persons, by the unreasonable abuse of their knowledge, have raised such objections, they must be answered: and it is then necessary to shew in what sense these representations ought to be taken; and that they are to be understood by way of comparison, as condescensions to our weakness.

But though these objections are easily answered, yet he who makes them unnecessarily is by no means excused, because they often occasion disturbance to weak people. Many that may be shocked by the difficulty, may not be capable of readily understanding the answers; and therefore thus to raise such scruples, is to lay a stumbling-block in the way of our weak brethren, and perplex them with notions and curiosities, the knowledge of which is no way necessary to salvation.

We ought, therefore, to consider that it was in great mercy and compassion to the ignorance and infirmity of men, that the Holy Spirit vouchsafed to give us such representations of the divine nature and attributes. He knew what knowledge was most proper for us, and what would most effectually work on us to perform our duty: and if we take things as the Scripture represents them, it cannot be denied but they are well adapted to our capacities, and must have a mighty influence on all that sincerely believe them; in truth, greater than all those nice speculations that we endeavour to substitute in their place.

But, thirdly, if we consider seriously the knowledge that we have of the creatures, and even of those things in this world with which we are most familiarly acquainted, it will appear that the conceptions we have of them are much of the same sort as those are which religion gives us of God, and that they neither represent the nature or essential properties of the things as they are in themselves, but only the effects they have in relation to us: for in most cases we know no more of them but only how they affect us, and what sensations they produce in us.

Thus, for example, light and the sun are the most familiar and useful things in nature: we have the comfortable perception of them by our senses of seeing and feeling, and enjoy the benefit and advantage of them; but what they are in themselves we are entirely ignorant.

I think it is agreed by most that write of natural philosophy, that light and colours are nothing but the effects of certain

bodies and motions on our sense of seeing, and that there are no such things at all in nature, but only in our minds: and of this, at least, we may be certain, that light in the sun or air are very different things from what they are in our sensations of them; yet we call them both by the same name, and term that which is only, perhaps, a motion in the air, light, because it begets in us that conception which is truly light. But it would seem very strange to the generality of men if we should tell them that there is no light in the sun, or colours in the rainbow; and yet, strictly speaking, it is certain, that which in the sun causes the conception of light in us, is as truly different in nature from the representation we have of it in our minds, as our foreknowledge is from what we call so in God.

The same may be observed concerning the objects of our other senses, such as heat and cold, sweet and bitter, and which we ascribe to the things that affect our touch and taste: whereas it is manifest that these are only the sensations that the actions of outward things produce in us: for the fire that burns us has no such pain in it as we feel when we complain of its heat, nor ice such as we call cold.

Nevertheless, we call the things, whose actions on our senses cause these sensations in us, by the same name we give to our conceptions of them, and treat and speak of them as if they were the same: we say the fire is hot, because it produceth heat in us; and that the sun is light, because it affects our eyes in such a manner as enables us to frame that thought which we then perceive in ourselves: but in the mean time we are altogether ignorant what it is particularly in the fire and the sun that has these effects on us, or how it comes thus to affect us. And yet this ignorance of ours does not hinder us from the use or advantage that nature designed us in these sensations, nor does our transferring to the objects themselves the names that we give our own perceptions of them draw any evil consequences after it; on the contrary, they serve the uses of life as well as if we knew the very things themselves. The sun, by giving me the sensation of light, directs and refreshes me as much as if I knew what its nature and true substance are. For, in truth, men are no farther concerned to know the nature of anything than as it relates to them, and has some effect on them. And if they know the effects of outward things, and how far they are to use or avoid them, it is sufficient.

If, then, such knowledge of natural things, as only shews the effects they have on us, be sufficient to all the uses of life, though we do not know what they are in themselves; why should not the like representation of God and his attributes be

sufficient for the ends of religion, though we be ignorant of his and their nature?

Every one knows that steadiness, regularity, and order, do always proceed from wisdom. When, therefore, we observe these in the highest degree in all the works of God, shall we not say that God is infinitely wise, because we are ignorant what that really is in itself which produces such stupendous effects?—though after all, wisdom, as in us, be as different from what we call so in God as light in our conception is different from the motion in the air that causes it.

We all of us feel a tendency to the earth, which we call gravity, but none ever yet was able to give any satisfactory account of its nature or cause; but inasmuch as we know that falling down a precipice will crush us to pieces, the sense we have of this effect of it is sufficient to make us careful to avoid such a fall. And in like manner, if we know that breaking God's commands will provoke him to destroy us, will not this be sufficient to oblige us to obedience, though we be ignorant what it is we call anger in him?

I might go through all the notices we have of natural things, and shew that we only know and distinguish them by the effects they produce on our senses, and make you sensible that such knowledge sufficiently serves the purposes of life. And no reason can be given why the representations given us in Scripture of God and divine things, though they do only shew us the effects that proceed from them, should not be sufficient to answer the purposes of religion.

Particularly we ascribe foreknowledge to God, because we are certain that he cannot be surprised by any event, nor be at any loss what he is to do when it happens: and thereby we give him all the perfection we can, and assure ourselves that we cannot deceive him.

After the same manner we ascribe predestination to him, and conceive him as predetermining everything that comes to pass, because all his works are as steady and certain as if he had predetermined them after the same manner that wise men do theirs.

We farther represent him as absolutely free, and all his actions as arising only from himself, without any other consideration but that of his own will; because we are sure the obligations we owe to him are as great as if he acted in this wise. We are as much obliged to magnify his free mercy and favour to us, to humble our minds before him, and return our tribute of gratitude to him, as if our salvation entirely proceeded from his mere good will and pleasure, without anything being required on our part in order to it.

Let me in the fourth place observe, that as we transfer the actions of our own minds, our powers, and virtues, by analogy, to God, and speak of him as if he had the like; so we proceed the same way in the representations we make to one another of the actions of our minds, and ascribe the powers and faculties of bodies to the transactions that pass in them. Thus to weigh things, to penetrate, to reflect, are proper actions of bodies, which we transfer to our understandings, and commonly say that the mind weighs or penetrates things, that it reflects on itself or actions; thus to embrace or reject, to retain or let slip, are corporeal performances, and yet we ascribe the first to the will, and the last to the memory. And it is manifest that this does not cause any confusion to our notions: though none will deny but there is a vast difference between weighing a piece of money in a scale, and considering a thing in our minds; between one body's passing through another, which is properly penetrating, and the understanding's obtaining a clear notion of a thing hard to be comprehended. And so in all the rest there is, indeed, a resemblance and analogy between them, which makes us give the same names to each; but to compare them in all particulars, and expect they should exactly answer, would run us into great absurdities. As for example, it would be ridiculous to think that weighing a thing in our minds should have all the effects, and be accompanied with all the circumstances, that are observable in weighing a body.

Now to apply this, let us consider that love, hatred, wisdom, knowledge, and foreknowledge, are properly faculties or actions of our minds; and we ascribe them to God after the same manner that we do reflection, penetrating, discovering, embracing, or rejecting, to our intellectual actions or faculties, because there is some analogy and proportion between them. But then we ought to remember that there is as great a difference between these, when attributed to God, and as they are in us, as between weighing in a balance and thinking; in truth, infinitely greater; and that we ought no more to expect that the one should in all respects and circumstances answer the other, than that thinking in all things should correspond to weighing. Would you not be surprised to hear a man deny, and obstinately persist in it, that his mind can reflect upon itself, because it is impossible that a body, from whence the notion is originally taken, should move or act on itself? And is it not equally absurd to argue, that what we call foreknowledge in God cannot consist with the contingency or freedom of events, because our prescience, from whence we transfer the notion to the divine understanding, could not, if it were certain?

And is it not equally a sufficient answer to both, when we say that the reflection of bodies, though in many circumstances it resembles that action of the mind which we call so, yet in other particulars they are mighty unlike? And though the foreknowledge that we have in some things resembles what we term so in God, yet the properties and effects of these in other particulars are infinitely different.

Nor can we think that whatever is impossible in the one, must be likewise so in the other. It is impossible motion should be in a body, except it be moved by another, or by some other external agent; and it requires a space in which it is performed, and we can measure it by feet and yards: but we should look on him as a very weak reasoner that would deny any motion to be in the mind, because he could find none of those there; and we should think that we had sufficiently answered this objection, by telling him that these two motions are of very different natures, though there be some analogy and proportion between them. And shall not the same answer satisfy those that argue against the divine foreknowledge, predestination, and other actions attributed to God, because many things are supposed possible to them which are impossible to us?

It may be objected against this doctrine, that, if it be true, all our descriptions of God, and discourses concerning him, will be only figures and metaphors; that he will be only figuratively merciful, just, intelligent, and foreknowing: and perhaps, in time, religion, and all the mysteries thereof, will be lost in mere figure.

But I answer, that there is great difference between the analogical representations of God and that which we commonly call figurative. The common use of figures is to represent things that are otherwise very well known, in such a manner as may magnify or lessen, heighten or adorn, the ideas we have of them; and the design of putting them in this foreign dress, as we may call it, is to move our passions and engage our fancies more effectually than the true and naked view of them is apt to do, or perhaps ought. And from hence it too often happens that these figures are employed to deceive us, and make us think better or worse of things than they really deserve.

But the analogies and similitudes that the holy Scriptures, or our own reason, frame of divine things, are of another nature: the use of them is to give us some notion of things whereof we have no direct knowledge, and by that means lead us to perception of the nature, or at least of some of the properties and effects, of what our understandings cannot directly reach, and in this case to teach us how we are to behave ourselves towards

God, and what we are to do in order to obtain a more perfect knowledge of his attributes.

And whereas, in ordinary figurative representations, the thing expressed by the figure is commonly of much less moment than that to which it is compared : in these analogies the case is otherwise, and the things represented by them have much more reality and perfection in them than the things by which we represent them. Thus weighing a thing in our minds is a much more noble and perfect action than examining the gravity of a body by scale and balance, which is the original notion from whence it is borrowed ; and reflection as in our understandings is much more considerable than the rebounding of one hard body from another, which yet is the literal sense of reflection. And after the same manner, what we call knowledge and foreknowledge in God have infinitely more reality in them, and are of greater moment, than our understanding or prescience, from whence they are transferred to him ; and, in truth, these as in man are but faint communications of the divine perfections, which are the true originals, and which our powers and faculties more imperfectly imitate than a picture does a man : and yet, if we reason from them by analogy and proportion, they are sufficient to give us such a notion of God's attributes as will oblige us to fear, love, obey, and adore him.

If we lay these things together, I suppose they will furnish us with sufficient reasons to satisfy us why the holy Scriptures represent divine things to us by types and similitudes, by comparisons and analogies, and transferring to God the notions of such perfections as we observe in ourselves, or other creatures : since it appears that we are not capable of better ; that such knowledge answers all the designs of religion ; and that, when the matter is duly examined, we hardly know anything without ourselves in a more perfect manner.

I shall, therefore, proceed to the third and last thing I proposed, which was to shew the uses we ought to make of what has been said, particularly of God's foreknowing and predestinating his elect to holiness and salvation.

And, first, from the whole it appears that we ought not to be surprised when we find the Scriptures giving different and seemingly contradictory schemes of divine things.

It is manifest that several such are to be found in Holy Writ. Thus God is frequently said in Scripture to repent, and turn from the evil that he proposed against sinners ; and yet in other places we are told, that " God is not a man that he should lie, neither the son of man that he should repent." So in Numbers

xxiii. 19. Thus (Psalm xviii. 11) God is represented as dwelling in thick darkness : “ He made darkness his secret place ; his pavilion round about him were dark waters, and thick clouds of the sky.” And yet he is described as “ dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto, whom no man hath seen, nor can see.” And “ God is light, and in him is no darkness at all.” Thus in the second commandment God is represented as “ visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate him.” And yet “ the son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son ;” and “ the soul that sinneth, it shall die.”

After the same manner we are forbid by our Saviour “ to use vain repetitions as the heathen do ; or to think that we shall be heard for our much speaking ; because your Father knows what things ye have need of before ye ask him.” And yet we are encouraged “ always to pray, and not to faint :” and this is recommended to us by the parable of an importunate widow, who, through her incessant applications, became uneasy to the judge, and by her continual cries and petitions so troubled him, that to procure his own ease he did her justice : “ Because this widow troubleth me, I will avenge her, lest by her continual coming she weary me.”

Thus it is said, “ the Lord spake unto Moses face to face, as a man speaketh to his friend.” And yet he declares to the same Moses, “ Thou canst not see my face ; for there shall no man see me and live.” There are multitudes of other instances of the like nature, that seem to carry some appearance of a contradiction in them, but are purposely designed, to make us understand that these are only ascribed to God by way of resemblance and analogy, and to correct our imaginations, that we may not mistake them for perfect representations, or think that they are in God in the same manner that the similitudes represent them, and to teach us not to stretch those to all cases, or farther than they are intended.

We ought to remember that two things may be very like one another in some respects, and quite contrary in others ; and yet to argue against the likeness in one respect from the contrariety in the other, is as if one should dispute against the likeness of a picture, because that is made of canvas, oil, and colours, whereas the original is flesh and blood.

Thus, in the present case, God is represented as an absolute Lord over his creatures, of infinite knowledge and power, that doth all things for his mere pleasure, and is accountable to

none; as one that “will have mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardens;” that foresees, predestinates, calls, justifies, glorifies whom he will, without any regard to the creatures whom he thus deals with. This gives us a mighty notion of his sovereignty, at once stops our mouths and silences our objections, obliges us to an absolute submission and dependence on him, and withal to acknowledge the good things we enjoy to be entirely due to his pleasure: this is plainly the design and effect of this terrible representation; and the meaning is, that we should understand that God is no way obliged to give us an account of his actions; that we are no more to enquire into the reasons of his dealing with his creatures, than if he really treated them in this arbitrary method. By the same we are taught to acknowledge, that our salvation as entirely depends on him, and that we owe it as much to his pleasure, as if he had bestowed it on us without any other consideration but his own will to do so. Thus “of his own will begat he us with the word of truth, that we should be a kind of first-fruits of his creatures.” And that we might not think there could be anything in our best works, the prospect whereof could move God to shew kindness to us, the Scriptures give us to understand, that those good works are due to his grace and favour, and the effects, not causes of them. So Ephes. ii. 10: “For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them.”

All which representations are designed as a scheme, to make us conceive the obligations we owe to God, and how little we can contribute to our own happiness. And to make us apprehend this to be his meaning, he has, on other occasions, given us an account of his dealing with men, not only different, but seemingly contradictory to this. Thus he frequently represents himself as proposing nothing for his own pleasure or advantage in his transactions with his creatures; as having no other design in them but to do those creatures good; as earnestly desiring and prosecuting that end only. Nay, he represents himself to us as if he were as uneasy and troubled, when we failed to answer his expectations, as we may conceive a good, merciful, and beneficent prince, that had only his subjects’ happiness in view, would be, when they refused to join with him for promoting their own interest. And God, farther to express his tenderness towards us, and how far he is from imposing anything on us, lets us know that he has left us to our own freedom and choice; and, to convince us of his impartiality, declares that he acts as

a just and equal judge, that he hath no respect of persons, and favours none, but rewards and punishes all men, not according to his own pleasure, but according to their deserts: "and in every nation he that fears him, and works righteousness, is accepted with him."

Whoever is acquainted with the holy Scriptures, will find all these things plainly delivered to them. Thus, to shew us that God proposes no advantages to himself in his dealings with us, he is described as a person wholly disinterested: "Can a man be profitable unto God, as he that is wise may be profitable unto himself? Is it any pleasure to the Almighty that thou art righteous? or is it gain to him that thou makest thy ways perfect?" And, "If thou sinnest, what dost thou against him? or if thy transgressions be multiplied, what dost thou unto him? If thou be righteous, what givest thou him, or what receiveth he of thine hand?" And as to his leaving us to the liberty of our own choice, observe how he is represented: "I call heaven and earth this day to record against you, that I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing; therefore choose life."

And as to his earnest concern for our salvation, he orders the prophet Ezekiel to deliver this message from him: "Say unto them, As I live, saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked, but that the wicked turn from his way and live. Turn ye, turn ye from your evil ways; for why will ye die, O house of Israel?" And, "How shall I give thee up, Ephraim? How shall I deliver thee, Israel? How shall I make thee as Admah? How shall I set thee as Zeboim? Mine heart is turned within me; my repentings are kindled together."

Every one may see how distant this view of God, and of his dealings with his creatures, is from the former: and yet, if we consider it as a scheme framed to make us conceive how graciously, mercifully, and justly God treats us, notwithstanding the supreme and absolute dominion he has over us, there will be no inconsistency between the two. You see here, that though the creatures be in his hand, as *clay* in the *potter's*, of which he may make vessels of *honour* or *dishonour*, without any injury, or being accountable; yet he uses that power with all the passionate love and concern that parents shew towards their children: and therefore we are to conceive of him as having all the tenderness of affection that parents feel in their heart towards their young ones; and that if he had been so affected, he could not (considering our circumstances) have gone farther than he has done to save us; that our destruction is as entirely due to

ourselves as if we were out of God's power, and absolutely in the hands of our own counsel.

If we take these as schemes designed to give us different views of God, and his transactions with men, in order to oblige us to distinct duties which we owe him, and stretch them no farther, they are very reconcilable. And to go about to clash the one against the other, and argue, as many do, that if the one be true, the other cannot, is full as absurd as to object against that article of our belief, that Christ sits on the right hand of God, because Scripture in other places, and plain reason, assure us that God hath neither hand nor parts.

And whilst a thing may in one respect be like another, and in other respects be like the contrary; and whilst we know that thing only by resemblance, similitude, or proportion, we ought not to be surprised that the representations are contrary, and taken from things that seem irreconcilable, or that the different views of the same thing should give occasion to different, nay, contrary schemes.

We ought farther to consider, that these are not so much designed to give us notions of God as he is in himself, as to make us sensible of our duty to him, and to oblige us to perform it. As for example, when the Scriptures represent God as an absolute Lord, that has his creatures entirely in his power, and treats them according to his pleasure; as one that is not obliged to consider their advantage at all, or anything but his own will; that may elect one to eternal salvation, and pass over another, or condemn him to eternal misery, without any other reason but because he will do so; when we read this, I say, in the holy Scriptures, we ought not to dispute whether God really acts thus or no, or how it will suit with his other attributes of wisdom and justice to do so; but the use we ought to make of it is to call to mind what duty and submission we ought to pay to one who may thus deal with us if he please, and what gratitude we ought to return him for electing and decreeing us to salvation, when he lay under no manner of obligation to vouchsafe us that favour.

Again, when we find him represented as a gracious and merciful Father, that treats us as children, that is solicitous for our welfare, that would not our death or destruction; that has done all things for our eternal happiness which could be done without violating the laws of our creation, and putting a force upon our natures; that has given us free will, that we might be capable of rewards at his hands, and have the pleasure of choosing for ourselves; which only can make us happy, and like unto himself, in the most noble operations of which a Being is capa-

ble ; that has given us all the invitations and encouragements to choose well that mercy could prompt him to, or that the justice which is due to himself and creatures would allow, and that never punishes us but when the necessity and support of his government requires he should : when we hear these things, we are not so much to enquire whether this representation exactly suits with what really passes in his mind, as how we ought to behave ourselves in such a case towards him that has dealt so graciously with us.

And though these representations be but descriptions fitted to our capacities, through God's great condescension towards us, yet it is certain that there is as much mercy, tenderness, and justice in the conduct of God as this scheme represents ; and on the other hand, that we owe as much fear, submission, and gratitude to him, as if the first were the method he took with us.

We make no scruple to acknowledge, that love and hatred, mercy and anger, with other passions, are ascribed to God ; not that they are in him as we conceive them, but to teach us how we are to behave ourselves toward him, and what treatment we may expect at his hands. And if so, why should we make any difficulty to think that foreknowledge, purposes, elections, and decrees are attributed to him, after the same way, and to the same intent ?

The second use that I shall make of this doctrine is to put you in mind how cautious we ought to be in our reasonings and deductions concerning things, of whose nature we are not fully apprized. It is true, that in matters we fully comprehend all is clear and easy to us, and we readily perceive the connexion and consistency of all the parts ; but it is not so in things to which we are in a great measure strangers, and of which we have only an imperfect and partial view, for in these we are very apt to fancy contradictions, and to think the accounts we receive of them absurd.

The truth of this is manifest from innumerable instances ; as for example, from the opinion of the Antipodes : whilst the matter was imperfectly known, how many objections were made against it ? How many thought they had proved to a demonstration the impossibility and contradiction of the thing ? And how far did they prevail with the generality of the world to believe them ? And yet how weak, and, in truth, foolish do all their arguments appear to men that know, and by experience understand the matter ?

Others will say the same concerning the motion of the earth, notwithstanding the great confidence with which many have undertaken to demonstrate it to be impossible ; the reason of

which is the imperfect knowledge we have of the thing: and as our understanding of it is more and more enlarged and cleared, the contradictions vanish.

Ought we not, then, to think all the contradictions we fancy between the foreknowledge of God and contingency of events, between predestination and free will, to be the effects of our ignorance and partial knowledge? May it not be in this, as in the matter of the Antipodes, and motion of the earth? May not the inconsistencies that we find in the one, be as ill-grounded as those that have been urged against the others? And have we not reason to suspect, nay, believe this to be the case, since we are sure that we know much less of God and his attributes, than of the earth and heavenly motions?

Even in the sciences that are most common and certain there are some things which, amongst those that are unacquainted with such matters, would pass for contradictions. As for example, let us suppose one should happen to mention *negative quantities* among persons strangers to the mathematics; and being asked what is meant by those words, should answer, that he understands by them quantities that are conceived to be less than nothing, and that one of their properties is, that being multiplied by a number less than nothing, the product may be a magnitude greater than any assigned. This might justly appear a riddle, and full of contradictions, and perhaps will do so to a great part of my auditors. Something less than nothing in appearance is a contradiction; a number less than nothing has the same face: that these should be multipliable on one another, sounds very oddly; and that the product of less than nothing upon less than nothing should be positive, and greater than any assigned quantity, seems inconceivable. And yet, if the most ignorant will but have patience, and apply themselves for instruction to the skilful in these matters, they will soon find all the seeming contradictions vanish, and that the assertions are not only certain, but plain and easy truths, that may be conceived without any great difficulty.

Ought we not, then, to suspect our own ignorance, when we fancy contradictions in the descriptions given us of the mysteries of our faith and religion? And ought we not to wait with patience till we come to heaven, the proper school where these things are to be learned? And, in the mean time, acquiesce in that light the Holy Spirit has given us in the Scriptures, which, as I have shewed, is sufficient to direct us in our present circumstances.

The third use I shall make of this doctrine is to teach us what answer we are to give that argument that has puzzled

mankind, and done so much mischief in the world. It runs thus: "If God foresee or predestinate that I shall be saved, I shall infallibly be so; and if he foresee or have predestinated that I shall be damned, it is unavoidable. And therefore it is no matter what I do, or how I behave myself in this life." Many answers have been given to this, which I shall not at present examine: I shall only add, that if God's *foreknowledge* were exactly conformable to ours, the consequence would seem just; but inasmuch as they are of as different a nature as any two faculties of our souls, it doth not follow (because our foresight of events, if we suppose it infallible, must presuppose a necessity in them) that therefore the divine prescience must require the same necessity in order to its being certain. It is true, we call God's *foreknowledge* and our own by the same name; but this is not from any real likeness in the nature of the faculties, but from some proportion observable in the effects of them; both having this advantage, that they prevent any surprise on the person endowed with them.

Now as it is true that no contingency or freedom in the creatures can any way deceive or surprise God, put him to a loss, or oblige him to alter his measures; so, on the other hand, it is likewise true that the divine prescience doth not hinder freedom; and a thing may either be or not be, notwithstanding that foresight of it which we ascribe to God. When, therefore, it is alleged, that if God foresees I shall be saved, my salvation is infallible, this doth not follow; because the foreknowledge of God is not like man's, which requires necessity in the event, in order to its being certain, but of another nature consistent with contingency: and our inability to comprehend this arises from our ignorance of the true nature of what we call foreknowledge in God; and it is as impossible we should comprehend the power thereof, or the manner of its operation, as that the eye should see a sound, or the ear hear light and colours.

Only of this we are sure, that in this it differs from ours, that it may consist either with the being or not being of what is said to be foreseen or predestinated. Thus St. Paul was a chosen vessel, and he reckons himself in the number of the predestinated, "having predestinated us to the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself;" and yet he supposes it possible for him to miss of salvation; and therefore he looked on himself as obliged to use mortification, and exercise all other graces, in order to make his calling and election sure, lest, as he tells us "that by any means, when I have preached to others, I myself should be a cast-away," or a reprobate, as the word is translated in other places.

The fourth use I shall make of this doctrine is to enable us to discover what judgment we are to pass on those that have managed this controversy: and, for mine own part, I must profess, that they seem to me to have taken shadows for substances, resemblances for the things they represent; and, by confounding these, have embroiled themselves and readers in inextricable difficulties.

Whoever will look into the books writ on either side, will find this to be true. But because that is a task too difficult for the generality of men, let them consider the two schemes of the Predestinarians and Freewillers, in the present Bishop of Sarum's "Exposition of the Seventeenth Article of our Church;" where they will, as I think, find the opinions of both parties briefly, fully, and fairly represented, and withal perceive this error runs through both.

As for example, the great foundation of the one scheme is, that God acts for himself and his glory, and therefore he can only consider the manifestation of his own attributes and perfections in every action; and hence they conclude that he must only damn or save men, as his doing of one or other may most promote his glory.

But here it is manifest that they who reason thus are of opinion, that the desire of glory doth really move the will of God; whereas glory, and the desire of it, are only ascribed to God in an analogical sense, after the same manner as hands and feet, love and hatred are: and when God is said to do all things for his own glory, it is not meant that the desire of glory is the real end of his actions, but that he has ordered all things in such an excellent method, that, if he had designed them for no other end, they could not have set it forth more effectually. Now to make this figurative expression the foundation of so many harsh conclusions, and the occasion of so many contentions and divisions in the Church, seems to me the same kind of mistake that the Church of Rome commits, in taking the words of Scripture, "This is my body," literally; from whence so many absurdities and contradictions to our senses and reason are inferred.

Secondly, if you look diligently into these schemes, you will find a great part of the dispute arises on this question—what is first or second in the mind of God? Whether he first foresees and then determines, or first determines and by virtue of that foresees? This question seems the more strange, because both parties are agreed, that there is neither first nor last in the divine understanding, but all is one single act in him, and continues the same from all eternity. What, then, can be the

meaning of the dispute? Sure it can be no more than this—whether it be more honourable for God that we should conceive him as acting this way or that, since it is confessed that neither reaches what really passes in his mind: so that the question is not concerning the operations of God, as they are in themselves, but concerning our way of conceiving them, whether it be more for his honour to represent them according to the first or second scheme; and certainly the right method is to use both on occasion, so far as they may help us to conceive honourably of the Divine Majesty; and to deal ingenuously with the world, and tell them, that where these schemes have not that effect, or where, through our stretching them too far, they induce us to entertain dishonourable thoughts of him, or encourage disobedience, they are not applicable to him. In short, that God is as absolute as the first represents him, and man as free as the last would have him to be; and that these different and seemingly contradictory schemes are brought in to supply the defects of one another.

And therefore, thirdly, the managers of this controversy ought to have looked on these different schemes as chiefly designed to inculcate some duties to us, and to have pressed them no farther than as they tended to move and oblige us to perform those duties. But they, on the contrary, have stretched these representations beyond the Scripture's design, and set them up in opposition to one another, and have endeavoured to persuade the world that they are inconsistent; insomuch that some, to establish contingency and free will, have denied God's prescience; and others, to set up predestination, have brought in a fatal necessity of all events.

And not content therewith, they have accused one another of impiety and blasphemy, and mutually charged each the other's opinion with all the absurd consequences they fancied were deducible from it. Thus the maintainers of free will charge the predestinarians as guilty of ascribing injustice, tyranny, and cruelty to God; as making him the author of all the sin and misery that is in the world: and, on the other hand, the asserters of predestination have accused the others as destroying the independency and dominion of God, and subjecting him to the will and humours of his creatures: and if either of the schemes were to be taken literally and properly, the maintainers of them would find difficulty enough to rid themselves of the consequences charged on them; but if we take them only as analogical representations, as I have explained them, there will be no ground or reason for these inferences.

And it were to be wished that those who make them would

consider, that if they would prosecute the same method in treating the other representations that the Scriptures give us of God's attributes and operations, no less absurdities would follow: as for example, when God is said to be merciful, loving, and pitiful, all-seeing, jealous, patient, or angry; if these were taken literally, and understood the same way as we find them in us, what absurd and intolerable consequences would follow; and how dishonourably must they be supposed to think of God who ascribe such passions to him! Yet nobody is shocked at them, because they understand them in an analogical sense. And if they would but allow predestination, election, decrees, purposes, and foreknowledge, to belong to God, with the same difference, they would no more think themselves obliged to charge those that ascribe them to him with blasphemy, in the one case, than in the other.

It is, therefore, incumbent on us to forbear all such deductions, and we should endeavour to reconcile these several representations together, by teaching the people that God's knowledge is of another nature than ours; and that though we cannot, in our way of thinking, certainly foresee what is free and contingent, yet God may do it by that power which answers to prescience in him, or rather, in truth, supplies the place of it: nor is it any wonder that we cannot conceive how this is done, since we have no direct or proper notion of God's knowledge; nor can we ever in this life expect to comprehend it, any more than a man who never saw can expect to discern the shape and figure of bodies at a distance whilst he continues blind.

The fifth use we are to make of what has been said is to teach us how we are to behave ourselves in a church, where either of these schemes is settled and taught as a doctrine: and here I think the resolution is easy; we ought to be quiet, and not unseasonably disturb the peace of the Church, much less should we endeavour to expose what she professes, by alleging absurdities and inconsistencies in it. On the contrary, we are obliged to take pains to shew that the pretended consequences do not follow, as in truth they do not; and to discharge all that make them, as enemies of peace and false accusers of their brethren, by charging them with consequences they disown, and that have no other foundation but the maker's ignorance.

For, in truth, as has been already shewed, if such inferences be allowed, hardly any one attribute or operation of God, as ascribed in Scripture, will be free from the cavils of perverse men.

It is observable, that by the same way of reasoning, and by

the same sort of arguments, by which some endeavour to destroy the divine prescience and render his decrees odious, Cotta long ago, in Cicero, attacked the other attributes, and undertook to prove that God can neither have reason nor understanding, wisdom nor prudence, nor any other virtue. And if we understand these literally and properly, so as to signify the same when applied to God and to men, it will not be easy to answer his arguments; but if we conceive them to be ascribed to him by proportion and analogy—that is, if we mean no more, when we apply them to God, than that he has some powers and faculties, though not of the same nature, which are analogous to these advantages which these could give him if he had them, enabling him to produce all the good effects which we see consequent to them when in the greatest perfection—then the arguments used by Cotta against them have no manner of force, since we do not plead for such an understanding, reason, justice, and virtue as he objects against, but for more valuable perfections that are more than equivalent, and, in truth, infinitely superior to them, though called by the same names because we do not know what they are in themselves, but only see their effects in the world, which are such as might be expected from the most consummate reason, understanding, and virtue.

And after the same manner, when perverse men reason against the prescience, predestination, and the decrees of God, by drawing the like absurd consequences as Cotta doth against the possibility of his being endowed with reason and understanding, &c., our answer is the same as before mentioned. If these be supposed the very same in all respects, when attributed to God, as we find them in ourselves, there would be some colour, from the absurdities that would follow, to deny that they belong to God; but when we only ascribe them to him by analogy, and mean no more than that there are some things answerable to them, from whence, as principles, the divine operations proceed, it is plain that all such arguments not only lose their force, but are absolutely impertinent.

It is, therefore, sufficient for the ministers of the Church to shew that the established doctrine is agreeable to Scripture, and teach their people what use ought to be made of it, and to caution them against the abuse; which if they do with prudence, they will avoid contentions and divisions, and prevent the mischiefs which are apt to follow the mistaken representations of it.

This is the method taken by our Church in her seventeenth Article, where we are taught that “predestination to life is the everlasting purpose of God, whereby, before the foundations of

the world were laid, he hath constantly decreed, by his council, secret to us, to deliver from curse and damnation those whom he hath chosen in Christ out of mankind, and to bring them by Christ to everlasting salvation. And that the godly consideration of predestination, and our election in Christ, is full of sweet, pleasant, and unspeakable comfort to godly persons, as well because it doth greatly establish their faith of eternal salvation, to be enjoyed through Christ, as because it doth fervently kindle their love toward God. And yet we must receive God's promises as they be generally set forth to us in holy Scripture." Here you see the two schemes joined together; and we are allowed all the comfort that the consideration of our being predestinated can afford us; and at the same time we are given to understand that the promises of God are generally conditional, and that, notwithstanding our belief of predestination, we can have no hope of obtaining the benefit of them, but by fulfilling the conditions. And I hope I have explained them in such a way as shews them to be consistent in themselves, and of great use towards making us holy here and happy hereafter.

NOTES.

As I advanced (says Mr. Faber) in my researches, though for quite a different purpose, I was struck with perceiving that, in the early writings of the Church, neither Calvinism, nor Arminianism, nor Nationalism (if, for want of a better name, I may so designate the system of Mr. Locke), could, as systems combining severally a well-defined scheme of causation with a well-defined scheme of ideality, be anywhere discovered.

We find, indeed, the scheme of causation, which is common alike to Calvinism and to Nationalism, occurring in the oldest ecclesiastical documents that have come down to us: and we also find the scheme of causation, which specially characterizes Arminianism, prominent in various writings subsequent to the time of Clement of Alexandria, with whom that scheme appears to have originated.

But for the scheme of ideality which is common alike to Calvinism and to Arminianism, and for the scheme of ideality which is peculiar to Nationalism, we shall vainly search the records of proper antiquity: they were equally unknown to that Church, which, either in a more or in a less restricted sense, may justly be denominated Primitive.

Hence, I believe, it may be truly said, that, as systems, the three systems in question were altogether unknown to the ancients.—*Faber on Election. Preface*, pp. 9, 10.

That some doctrine of election is taught in holy Scripture, can be doubted, I think, by no one, who, with even moderate attention, peruses the sacred volume.

But as to what doctrine of election is inculcated in holy Scripture, much diversity of opinion may easily prevail: for this matter can in no wise be deemed a point equally evident.

Accordingly, while the bare fact of the scriptural inculcation of some predestinarian doctrine has never been denied, great difference of sentiment has subsisted, and indeed still subsists, in regard to the important question of what predestinarian doctrine ought to be received as the mind of divine revelation.

Three several schemes of exposition have been advanced and maintained, as respectively setting forth what ought to be esteemed the genuineness of scriptural verity.

1. By the Remonstrants, or Arminians, the idea of election is pronounced to be the election of certain individuals, out of the great mass of mankind, directly and immediately, to eternal life: and its moving cause is asserted to be God's eternal prevision of the future persevering holiness and consequent moral fitness of the individuals themselves, who thence have been thus elected.

2. By the Nationalists (if, for the convenience of brief nomenclature, I may employ the term), the idea of election is determined to be the election of certain whole nations into the pale of the visible Church Catholic; which election, however, relates purely to their privileged condition in this world, extending not to their collective eternal state

in another world : and its moving cause is pronounced to be that same absolute good pleasure of God, which, through the exercise of his sovereign power, led him to choose the posterity of Jacob, rather than the posterity of Esau, that upon earth they should become his peculiar people, and be made the depositories and preservers of the true religion.

3. By the Calvinists, or Austinists, the idea of election is judged to be the election of certain individuals, out of the great mass of mankind, directly and immediately, to eternal life, while all other individuals are either passively left or actively doomed to a certainty of eternal death : and its moving cause is defined to be God's unconditional and irrespective will and pleasure, inherent in, and exercised in consequence of his absolute and uncontrollable sovereignty.—*Faber on the Doctrine of Election*, pp. 3, 4, 5.

Finally, for the satisfaction of our own minds, or (if we may say so without presumption) to vindicate the ways of God to man, it may be useful, still with the primitive Church for our guide and assistant, to enquire into the rationale or principle of the doctrine of election, as that doctrine was received from Scripture and from the apostles by venerable antiquity.

The result, then, to which I have been conducted, is this.

As contradistinguished, both from the doctrine of Calvinistic election, from the more plausible doctrine of Arminian election, and from the present (I believe) somewhat popular doctrine of National election, the primitive Christians, anterior to the time of Augustine, held, in point of ideality, the doctrine of an election of certain individuals out of all nations into the pale of the visible Church ; with the merciful purpose and intention, on God's part, that through faith and holiness they should attain to everlasting life ; but (since the immediate notion of their election respected only an admission into the Church, not an admission into heaven) with a possibility, through their own perverseness, of their not making their calling and election sure, and of thus failing to obtain the conditionally promised reward.

This, in point of ideality, was, so far as I can find, the unvaried doctrine of the Catholic Church, down to the time of Augustine : but, in point of causation, a very important variety may easily be traced.

Anterior to the time of Clement of Alexandria, who flourished about the latter end of the second century, the impelling cause of election was believed to be the absolute will and sovereign pleasure of God.

But, after the time of Clement, the impelling cause of election was commonly, though not quite universally, supposed to be God's foreknowledge of man's future fitness.

This change, in point of causation, so far as we can venture to pronounce upon existing evidence, was first introduced by Clement of Alexandria himself. Its design was to remove any objections to the older scheme which might be started upon the score of God's justice : and its plausibility, united to some shew of accordance with Scripture, secured for it a rapid and easy reception. Such being its character, it produced no controversy. At all events, the fact of the change itself is certain : and no controversy, so far as I know, is recorded.

A system thus characterized will naturally have its own con-

ventional phraseology: and, unless the true drift and bearing of the system be known, the phraseology will be very apt to be misunderstood.

Accordingly, its really *generic* language has often erroneously been deemed *particular*.

All, without any individual exceptions, who, agreeably to the good pleasure of the divine will, have been elected into the Church, are generically addressed as heirs of glory.

But such language does not import, particularly, that every elected individual will infallibly obtain the inheritance. On the contrary, the promises of God must be received as they are *generally or generically* set forth in holy Scripture.—*Faber on Election*, pp. 221, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6.

Having thus ascertained, negatively, what scheme of doctrine, respecting election, the Church of England does not hold; we may now, with some advantage, proceed to enquire, positively, what scheme of doctrine, respecting election, the Church of England does hold.

Our enquiry into this matter will, of course, divide itself into two branches: the ideality of election, and the causation of election.

Let us begin with investigating the ideality of election, as maintained and taught by the Church of England.

In an examination of the present description, we naturally first advert to a formal and professed enunciation of doctrine, if any such exist.

Now an enunciation of this precise sort will be found in the seventeenth Article of the Anglican Church.

With the seventeenth Article, therefore, our enquiry will, both the most regularly and the most legitimately, commence.

This Article, as it first came out of the hands of its author, Archbishop Cranmer, when, in the year 1553, the Book of Articles was ratified and published, ran in terms following:—

“Predestination to life is the everlasting purpose of God, whereby (before the foundations of the world were laid) he hath constantly decreed, by his council, secret to us, to deliver from curse and damnation those whom he hath chosen out of mankind, and to bring them by Christ to everlasting salvation, as vessels made to honour. Wherefore, they, which be endued with so excellent a benefit of God, be called according to God’s purpose, by his Spirit working in due season: they be justified freely: they be made sons of adoption: they be made like the image of the only-begotten Jesus Christ: they walk religiously in good works: and at length, by God’s mercy, they attain to everlasting felicity.

“As the godly consideration of predestination and our election in Christ is full of sweet, pleasant, and unspeakable comfort to godly persons, and such as feel in themselves the working of the Spirit of Christ mortifying the works of the flesh and their earthly members, and drawing up their minds to high and heavenly things, as well because it doth greatly establish and confirm their faith of eternal salvation to be enjoyed through Christ, as because it doth fervently kindle their love toward God: so, for curious and carnal persons, lacking the Spirit of Christ, to have continually before their eyes the sentence of God’s predestination, is a most dangerous downfall, whereby the devil doth

thrust them either into desperation, or into wretchedness of most unclean living, no less perilous than desperation.

"Furthermore, though the decrees of predestination be unknown to us, yet must we receive God's promises in such wise as they be generally set forth to us in holy Scripture : and, in our doings, that will of God is to be followed which we have expressly declared unto us in the word of God."

Such was the original form of the famous seventeenth Article.

Now, in order to understand its real drift and purport, we must obviously begin with ascertaining the sentiments of the illustrious individual, under whose influence, and in accordance with whose solicited advice, it was composed : and, when we shall thus have obtained the true key to the Article, we may then, with some reasonable prospect of advantage, apply it to the phrasology of the Article itself.

Melancthon, in a letter to Cranmer, strongly reprobated that frequent introduction of new-fangled schemes of doctrine relative to scriptural election, which, in the way of mere unauthorized private exposition, sprang up from a neglect of simple and sincere Christian antiquity.

Hence we may be quite sure, that the mode in which Melancthon theologized was the very reverse of that which he condemned : in other words, we may be quite sure, that Melancthon, when he renounced what he calls the Stoical and Manichæan Insanity of Fatalism, would resort to Christian antiquity, for the purpose of settling the true doctrine of scriptural election and predestination.

In this wise and rational plan of theologizing, Cranmer perfectly concurred : for, though most happy to solicit and to profit by the advice of such a divine as Melancthon, he did not blindly build upon it ; but, on the contrary, in composing the seventeenth Article, he is stated, by his first Protestant successor, Parker, to have been most diligent in reading the oldest fathers, both Greek and Latin, and in examining ecclesiastical antiquity quite up to the time of the apostles.

Now, purely in the way of coming at mere matter of fact, such a process must have convinced both Melancthon and Cranmer, that the doctrine maintained and taught by primitive antiquity was, in point of ideality, the doctrine of ecclesiastical individual election.

Accordingly, Melancthon, in delivering his sentiments on this topic, is full, and express, and ambiguous.

He contended that the Catholic Church collectively is the election or the elect Church of God ; because, as a body, it is chosen out of the corrupt mass of the entire human race. And thence he maintained, that all the members of the elect Catholic Church, inasmuch as they are thus component parts of the election, constitute individually the elect people of God.

This being the view taken by Melancthon, he indisputably must have held the true ancient ideality of election to be an election of individuals, out of the great corrupt mass of mankind, into the pale of the visible Church, with God's morally-acting purpose and intention, that the elect, profiting by their privileges of election, should finally attain everlasting felicity.

Such, as stated by himself, was the doctrinal system of Melancthon ; a system professedly adopted from the pure source of primitive Chris-

tian antiquity: such, therefore, was the system which Cranmer, acting by the advice of Melancthon, and in consequence of his own diligent researches into the same antiquity, embodied in the seventeenth Article of the Church of England.

To the phraseology, then, of that Article, opened by the key with which we have been furnished by the explicitness of Melancthon, let us now attend; reading the Article under the impression that it was the work of Cranmer, who had consulted Melancthon on the subject treated of in it, and who, like Melancthon, rejecting the various unauthoritative phantasies of mere licentious private judgment, had resorted to venerable antiquity for information and instruction.

Election, whether absolute and unconditional, or previsional and conditional, is equally, both on the Calvinistic scheme and on the Arminian scheme, an election of certain individuals, directly and immediately, to eternal life.

But as this notion agrees not with the ideality of election maintained by the primitive Church to be the true sense of Scripture, so, unless I greatly mistake, it agrees as little with the ideality of election maintained, under the joint influence of Melancthon and Cranmer, by the reformed Church of England.

In respect to the point of ideality, the Anglican Church, when, in the seventeenth Article, she speaks of predestination to life, teaches not an election of certain individuals, either absolute or previsional, directly and immediately to eternal happiness; but she teaches an election of certain individuals into the Church Catholic, in order that there, according to the everlasting purpose and morally-operating intention of God, they may be delivered from curse and damnation, and thus, indirectly and mediately, may be brought, through Christ, to everlasting salvation; agreeably to God's promises, as they are generically, not specifically, set forth to us in holy Scripture.

That such is the real doctrine of the Church of England; in other words, that she teaches a predestination to life, not direct and immediate, but indirect and mediate; inevitably follows from the circumstance, that, while in her sixteenth Article she hints at the possibility of the elect individually departing from grace given, in her homilies and in her burial service she distinctly states, that the elect, in her sense of the word, may, in their individual capacity, fall away utterly, and thus perish finally. Now this statement is palpably incompatible with the tenet of a direct and immediate predestination of individuals to eternal life; for individuals so predestinated could not, by the very terms of their predestination, fall away utterly and irrecoverably. Therefore the predestination to life, mentioned in the seventeenth Article, can only mean an indirect and mediate predestination of individuals; or, in other words, it can only mean a predestination of individuals to eternal life, through the medium of election into the Catholic Church, in God's everlasting purpose and intention indeed: but still, since God, in executing his purpose and intention, operates upon the minds of his intelligent creatures not physically but morally, with a possibility of their defeating that merciful purpose and intention, and thence of their finally falling away to everlasting destruction.

As the Article, in connection with the other documents of the An-

glican Church, must, unless we place them in irreconcilable collision with each other, be understood to propound the doctrine of predestination after the manner and in the sense which has been specified ; so it distinctly enjoins us to receive God's promises as they are generally set forth to us in holy Scripture.

The import of the word *generally* is, I suspect, very often and very widely misapprehended by the readers of the seventeenth Article, as it occurs in the English form. The term is thought to be equivalent to *usually* or *for the most part* ; and thence the clause is supposed to teach, that, in the matter of election, God's promises must be received as they are most usually set forth in Scripture ; so that, in the interpretation of Holy Writ, we must not set one text in opposition to another text.

But this is in no wise either the meaning of the term, or the drift of the clause.

From its ambiguity, the word *generally* has, no doubt, been infelicitously selected : but a moment's inspection of the Article in its Latin form will shew us the import of the term. Its sense is, not *generally* as opposed to *unusually*, but *generally* as opposed to *particularly*. Had the word *generically* been used in the English form of the Article, instead of the word *generally*, all ambiguity would have been avoided ; and thus the real drift of the clause would have stood out plain and distinct.

The latter part of the Article is an explanation of its former part. We must embrace the doctrine of predestination to life : but then, as that predestination, through the medium of election into the Church Catholic, is, so far as respects particulars or individuals, only according to God's everlasting moral purpose and intention ; the promises of God, in regard to predestination and election, must be received *generically*, not *specifically*. That is to say, the promises of God must be received *generically*, with a reference to the whole collective Church of the election, which Christ has founded upon a rock, and which (agreeably to his express prophecy) can never be finally overturned : not received *specifically*, with a reference to a certain number of individuals of that Church, whose particular predestination to life might thence be erroneously pronounced absolute and irreversible.

In this explanation, furnished by the Article itself, we may plainly, in its very phraseology, detect the assisting hand of Melancthon : and, where his hand is detected, we can never doubt the real meaning.

"Great is the comfort (says he) that we assuredly know from the word of God, that, in his immense merey, on account of his Son, God is always collecting the Church among mankind, and that he does it by the voice of the Gospel. But you will say : This comfort avails, so far as my knowing that the Church is securely preserved for the benefit of others ; but perhaps that will not at all profit myself : for how shall I know who are the elect ? I answer : To thee also this generic comfort is profitable, because thou oughtest to believe that the Church is securely preserved for thy benefit also : and the commandment of God is eternal and immovable, that thou also shouldst hear the Son, shouldst repent, and shouldst believe that thou wilt be

received by God for the sake of the Mediator. Being such as thou art, it is certain, when thou departest from this life, that thou art in the number of the elect.”—*Faber on Election*, pp. 369-381.

With us the system of Calvin for so long a period superseded every other, and even still retains so many zealous advocates, that to a modern ear the very term Predestination seems to convey a meaning only conformable with his particular system. It should, however, be observed, that the word was in familiar use for centuries before the Reformation, in a sense very different from what he imputed to it; not as preceding the divine prescience, but as resulting from it, much in the same sense as that in which it has since been supported by the Arminians. Yet, obvious as this appears, writers of respectability strangely persuade themselves, that immediately prior to the Reformation the doctrines of the Church of Rome were completely Calvinistical—a conclusion to which certainly none can subscribe who are sufficiently conversant with the favourite productions of the time, who possess enough of fortitude to encounter the barbarisms of scholastical argument, and of patience to investigate its real object. So far, indeed, was this from being the fact, that Calvin peculiarly prided himself in departing from the common definition of the term, which had long been adopted by the adherents of the schools, and retained with a scrupulous precision. For while they held that the expression *prædestinati* is exclusively applicable to the elect, whom God, foreknowing as meritorious objects of his mercy, predestinates to life; and appropriated that of *præsciti* to the non-elect, whose perseverance in transgression is simply foreknown; he, on the other side, treating the distinction as a frivolous subterfuge, contended, that God, decreeing the final doom of the elect and non-elect irrespectively, predestinates both, not subsequently, but previously to all foreknowledge of their individual dispositions, especially devotes the latter to destruction through the medium of crime, and creates them by a fatal destiny to perish. Whatsoever, therefore, modern conjecture may have attributed to the scholastics, it is certain that, abhorring every speculation which tends in the remotest degree to make God the author of sin, they believed that only salutary good is predestinated; grace to those who deserve it *congruously*, and glory to those who deserve it *condignly*.—*Laurence's Bampton Lectures*, serm. vii.

To the enquiry, why some are unendowed with grace? their answer was, because some are not willing to receive it, and not because God is unwilling to give it: he, they said, offers his light to all; he is absent from none; but man absents himself from the present Deity, like one who shuts his eyes against the noon-day blaze.—*Ibid.*

On the whole, it is evident that they considered the dignity of the individual as the meritorious basis of predestination; merit of congruity as the basis of a preordination to grace; and merit of condignity as that of a preordination to glory. Thus, not more fastidious in the choice of their terms than accurate in the use of them, while they denied that the prescience of human virtue, correctly speaking, could be the primary cause of the divine will, because nothing in time can properly give birth to that which has existed from eternity, they

strenuously maintained it to be a secondary cause, the ratio or rule in the mind of the Deity, which regulated his will in the formation of its ultimate decisions.

To enter more minutely into the detail of scholastical disquisition upon this topic, appears unnecessary—at least, to the illustration of any opinions entertained by the Lutherans, whose peculiar tenets I proceed in the next place to consider.

It should previously, however, be observed, that, although in the established confession of their faith all allusion to the subject was avoided, it was nevertheless introduced into another work of importance, and of considerable public authority—the “*Loci Theologici*,” of Melancthon, a production which, at the period under review, was everywhere received as the standard of Lutheran divinity. Both Luther and Melancthon, after their creed became permanently settled at the diet of Augsburg, kept one object constantly in view—to inculcate only what was plain and practical, and never to attempt philosophizing. They perceived that before the Reformation the doctrine of divine foreknowledge had been grossly misconceived and abused, although guarded by all the logic of the schools; and they felt that, after it, they had themselves at first contributed to increase the evil, by grounding upon the same high argument, although for a very different purpose, the position of an infallible necessity; and thenceforward, therefore, they only taught a predestination which the Christian religion explains, and the Christian life exemplifies.

But to what, it may be said, did the Lutherans object in the theory of their opponents, when they abandoned the tenet of necessity? Certainly not to the sobriety and moderation of that part of it which vindicated the justice, and displayed the benevolence, of the Almighty; but generally to the principles upon which it proceeded; to its presumption in overleaping the boundary which Heaven has prescribed to our limited faculties, and which we cannot pass without plunging into darkness and error; and to its impiety in disregarding, if not despising, the most important truths of Christianity. A system of such a nature they hesitated not to reject, anxious to conduct themselves by the light of Scripture alone, nor presuming to be wise above what God had been pleased to discover. Thus, while their adversaries philosophized upon a predestination of individuals, preferred one before another by divine regard, because worthy of such a preference, they taught only that which has been revealed with certainty—the predestination of a peculiar *description* of persons, “of a people zealous of good works,” of the Christian Church contemplated as an aggregate, not on account of its own dignity, but on account of Christ, its supreme Head, and the Author of eternal salvation to all who obey him. Maintaining, not a particular election of personal favourites, either by an absolute will, or by a conditional one, dependent upon the ratio of merit, but a general election of all, who by baptism in their infancy, or by faith and obedience in maturer years, become the adopted heirs of heaven; they conceived this to be the only election to which the Gospel alludes, and consequently the only one upon which we can speak with confidence, or reason without presumption.—*Ibid.*

The object of Luther was to debar all enquiry into a divine will antecedent to Christianity, and to make the predestination of the person consequent to the conduct of the Christian; an object which Calvin despised, and an order which he reversed. "In his persevera, tanquam murus aëneus, nihil aliud inculcari tibi sinens, quam quo modo se ipse ostendit et manifestat per verbum Christi." (Vol. v., p. 197). "Ac initio quidem voluit Deus occurrere huic curiositati; sic enim suam voluntatem et consilium proposuit: 'Ego tibi præscientiam et prædestinationem egregie manifestabo, sed non ista via rationis et sapientiæ carnalis, sicut tu imaginaris: sic faciam; ex Deo non revelato fiam revelatus, et tamen idem Deus manebo.'.....Tu habes Evangelium, es baptizatus, habes absolutionem, es Christianus, et tamen dubitas?.....Deus dicit tibi, 'En habes filium meum, hunc audias et acceptes. Id si facis, jam certus es de fide et salute tua.'.....Omittendæ sunt disputationes, et dicendum, 'Ego sum Christianus.'.....Dedit tibi firmissima argumenta certitudinis et veritatis suæ. Dedit Filium in carnem et mortem, instituit sacramenta, ut scias eum non velle fallacem esse, sed veracem. Atque ita de prædestinatione tua certus eris, remotis omnibus curiosis et periculosis quæstionibus de Dei arcanis consiliis." (Vol. vi., p. 355).—*Laurence's Notes*, p. 356.

The individual opinions of Cranmer upon the subject of predestination, probably because little known, have been seldom adduced. That he thought very differently from Calvin respecting universal redemption will, perhaps, be admitted. Neither is it difficult to shew, not only that he further differed from the Reformer of Geneva on the point of final perseverance, but that he held the same doctrine of regeneration and an election in Christ through baptism, which is so conspicuous in the offices of our Church. In his catechism his sentiments are thus delivered: "And we Christian men, although by baptism we be made the children of God, and receive the Holy Ghost," &c. (p. 192). "Here we mean a second birth, which is spiritual, whereby our inward man and mind is renewed of the Holy Ghost, so that our hearts and minds receive new desires, which they had not of their first birth or nativity. And the second birth is by the water of baptism, which Paul calleth the laver of regeneration, because our sins be forgiven us in baptism, and the Holy Ghost is poured into us, as into God's beloved children; so that by the power and working of the Holy Ghost we are born again spiritually, and made new creatures. And so by baptism we enter into the kingdom of God, and shall be saved for ever, if we continue to our lives' end in the faith of Christ." (p. 214). When speaking of adults, he observes, "All these benefits we receive by faith, in the which whosoever continueth unto the end of his life shall be saved; the which God grant to us all." (p. 121). "Take this for a sure conclusion, and doubt nothing thereof, that the Holy Ghost, as he hath begun these things in us, so he will finish the same, if we obey him, and continue in faith unto the end of our lives. For he that continueth unto the end shall be saved." (p. 143). Such were his ideas when our Liturgy was first compiled; and that they were not afterwards altered when he changed his opinion on the point of

the sacramental presence, we may conclude from the last of his productions, his answer to Gardiner, in which he says, "For this cause Christ ordained baptism in water, that as surely as we feel and touch the water, so assuredly ought we to believe, when we are baptized, that Christ is verily present with us, and that by him we be newly born again spiritually, and washed from our sins, and grafted in the stock of Christ's own body, and be apparelled, clothed, and harnessed with him in such wise, that as the devil hath no power against Christ, so hath he none against us, so long as we remain grafted in that stock, and be clothed with that apparel, and be harnessed with that armour." (p. 38). "The Holy Ghost doth not only come to us in baptism, and Christ doth there clothe us, but they do the same to us continually, so long as we dwell in Christ." (p. 71).

Upon the same points, the universality and defectibility of grace, points utterly incompatible with the Calvinistical theory, Latimer seems to have spoken no less decidedly than Cranmer. On the first head he adopted the following unambiguous mode of expression:—"The promises of Christ our Saviour are general; they pertain to all mankind. He made a general proclamation, saying, 'Whosoever believeth in me hath everlasting life!' Likewise St. Paul saith, 'The grace and mercies of God exceed far our sins.' Therefore let us ever think and believe that the grace of God, his mercy and goodness, exceedeth our sins. Also consider what Christ saith with his own mouth: 'Come to me, *all* ye that labour and are laden, and I will ease you.' Mark here he saith, 'Come *all* ye.' Wherefore, then, should any man despair, to shut out himself from these promises of Christ, which be general, and pertain to the whole world?" (Sermons, p. 182; ed. 1584). "Now, seeing that the Gospel is universal, it appeareth that he would have all mankind saved, and that the fault is not in Him if we be damned. For it is written thus: 'God would have *all* men to be saved.' His salvation is sufficient to save all mankind; but we are so wicked of ourselves that we refuse the same, and we will not take it when it is offered unto us; and therefore he said, 'Few are chosen.'" (p. 327). Is it possible for any man at all conversant with the writings of Luther and Melancthon on one side, and with those of Calvin on the other, to hesitate in determining from which the preceding language was derived? Nor was he deficient in precision upon the second head. On this he remarked, "I do not put you in comfort, that if you have *once* the Spirit ye cannot lose it. There be new spirits started up now of late that say, after we have received the Spirit we cannot sin. I will make but one argument. St. Paul had brought the Galatians to the profession of the faith, and left them in that state. They had received the Spirit *once*, and they sinned again. If this be true, we may lose the Spirit that we have once possessed. It is a fond thing; I will not tarry in it." (p. 84). "Whosoever purposely sinneth, *contra conscientiam*, against his conscience, he hath lost the Holy Ghost, the remission of sins, and finally Christ himself." (p. 170). "As there be many of us, which, when we fall willingly into sin against conscience, we lose the favour of God, our salvation, and finally the Holy Ghost." (p. 226). "That

man or woman that committeth such an act loseth the Holy Ghost and the remission of sins, and so becometh the child of the Devil, being before the child of God. Now he that is led so with sin, he is in the state of damnation, and sinneth damnably." (p. 227). We may one time be in the book, and another time come out again, as it appeareth by David, which was written in the book of life. But when he sinned, he at that same time was out of the book of the favour of God, until he had repented, and was sorry for his faults. So we may be in the book at one time, and afterward, when we forget God and his word, and do wickedly, we come out of the book; that is, out of Christ, who is the book." (p. 312).—*Laurence's Notes*, pp. 383-386.

It is recorded, both by Fox and Strype, that violent disputes upon the subject of predestination took place between the Protestant prisoners (particularly those in the King's Bench), during the persecution of Mary. The particulars of these disputes, it is generally supposed, are now lost. The contrary, however, appears to be the case; for in the Bodleian Library there is a manuscript (No. 1972, Cat. MS.) which contains a considerable portion, at least, of the controversy on both sides. As the circumstance is singular and curious, and as the precise opinions of the moderate party seem never to have been made public, I shall subjoin a few extracts from their own statements. At one period there was a disposition to sign general terms of concord; upon which occasion Trew, the leader of the Anti-Predestinarians, drew up articles of unity, the fourth and sixth of which we find thus expressed: "4. Also we confess, and believe, and faithfully acknowledge, that all salvation, justification, redemption, and remission of sins, cometh unto us wholly and solely through the mere mercy and favour of God in Jesus Christ, purchased unto us through his most precious death and blood-shedding, and in no part through any of our own merit, works, or deservings, how many or how good soever they be; and that his body was offered to the death once on the cross for all the sins of Adam, and for all and singular of his posterity's sins, how great and many soever they be; and that all that truly repent, unfeignedly believe with a lively faith, and persevere therein to the end of this mortal life, shall be saved, and that there is no decree of God to the contrary. 6. Also we do heartily acknowledge, confess, and believe, and are most assuredly certain by God's most holy word, that our Lord Jesus Christ's pure religion, and secret will, revealed in his word, sufficient for man's salvation, was in this realm declared and known in good King Edward the Sixth's days, which word of God was then truly preached and sufficiently taught, and his sacraments duly ministered, and of some followed; therefore we acknowledge them in England, Christ's true Church visible." (MS. p. 124).—*Laurence's Notes*, pp. 389, 390.

CHAPTER VI.

ORIGINAL SIN—TRADITION— REPENTANCE.

SECTION 1. *Jeremy Taylor on Original Sin.*

SECTION 2. *Sandys on Unwritten Tradition.*

SECTION 3. *Kidder on Repentance.*

PREFACE.

THE treatise on Original Sin, by Jeremy Taylor, is one of his most important works ; and although it is liable to be misunderstood by those who take it for an exposition of the *whole* doctrine, yet the points upon which he does touch are so clearly explained, that we know of no treatise more deserving an attentive consideration.

The positions which the eloquent bishop endeavours to prove are, as it will be perceived—

1. That no man is damned for the offence of Adam.
2. That therefore no infant can be damned at all.
3. That original sin does not cause so total a depravity of our nature as to make us love evil *as evil*.

Now, to do justice to Bishop Taylor, we must observe, first, that he nowhere denies the corruptions of human nature, but rather fully and freely acknowledges it, agreeing with and ably expounding the nineteenth Article of our Church. There is, indeed, one particular in which we are at liberty to differ with him, and that is the measure of Adam's superiority to us while yet in a state of innocence ;—and here we have the concurrent voice of Christian antiquity and pagan tradition with us, and against Taylor. According to that tradition, Adam was created capable, not only of perceiving the will of God, but also capable of performing it. It is true that he did it not ; but he had his choice—he was sufficient to have stood, though free to fall. We are placed in a widely different situation ; we have not only lost the strength which he possessed, but are placed in scenes of trial and temptation, which in a state of innocence could not have surrounded him. God has constituted the world, and willed that society should be constituted, in accordance with certain laws, which laws, by their restrictive character, lay a great check upon the indulgence of the natural inclinations. Our natural desires are of a general

character, and consequently not only innocent but necessary ; they are implanted within us for our benefit, and intended, under proper limitations, to be indulged. It is by the very existence of these limitations that we are, through desires *innocent* and *unavoidable* in themselves, led into sin : first, by extending our desires to improper objects ; and next, by extending them to allowable objects at improper times. To elucidate this we will take an instance. The desire to possess or acquire is given us for the wisest of purposes ; without it industry would have scarce an object, or sloth scarce a check ; and in a state of perfect innocence, where the institution of property must have been unknown, and all things enjoyed in common, its indulgence could have produced no mischief. This desire exists in all men, stronger in some than in others, but yet forming an universal and necessary part of the human character. It did not cease at the fall ; and now that the institution of property, and the necessary cessation of a community of goods, has rendered its indiscriminate indulgence productive of much sin and sorrow, of theft, robbery, violence, fraud, and too often of bloodshed ; now that all these direful consequences follow, the *moral force* by which man is enabled to resist temptation is so weakened that he falls an easy prey ; his power is withdrawn, while his necessities are increased ; temptations multiply round him, while his original inclinations remain in their full force ; and, through feelings intended for his preservation, he becomes the victim of transgression. Hence, then, it is to the fall that we owe the temptations around us, our inability to resist them, our blindness of mind that prevents our seeing their inevitable consequences, and that hardness of heart which prevents our feeling a due gratitude to our Creator and Preserver. This hardened, blind, and weak state, is the state in which, by reason of Adam's transgression, all his posterity are born. In our flesh, that is, naturally, dwelleth no good thing ; our boasted righteousness is but as filthy rags ; our best works, unless we are previously justified by the grace of God, partake of the nature of sin ; for since they are not done with a view to God's glory, and do not spring from a lively faith in his Son, they are, in the eyes of Him who looketh at the heart, sins of omission. They may

appear useful and honourable to our fellow-men, but *we* must exclaim, "we have left undone what we ought to have done."

Had not God been pleased to find a deliverer for us we must ever have remained in the awful condition in which we are placed. Nor should we stop here. Original sin produces actual sin; it operates, without fail, in every child of man: so that we are not only all born in sin, but all have sinned. We might ask, with a mournful triumph, those who deny this doctrine of God's word—Are you free from sin?—was ever any man free from its contaminating influence? Awful as this doctrine is, humbling to human pride, and repugnant to philosophy, falsely so called, yet to deny it, as too many do, entails consequences still more fearful; for if we are not fallen, if we are quick to see and strong to resist sin, then do we need neither to be raised nor supported, and the atonement of Christ is alike needless and useless. But lest it should be said—What, are we then exposed to the wrath of God for that which we cannot perceive, and which would be irresistible if we could? Are all the affections of our hearts thus totally perverted, and we, because weak as we are we cannot purify them, to suffer everlasting misery? We reply, we *are* born in sin and shapen in iniquity, for the Scriptures of truth declare it; our affections *are* turned to evil, but not through their fault, or His who implanted them, for He gave them for our good; but by sin, which hath rendered that to which they are turned evil. "I was alive (says the apostle) without the law once, but when the commandment came sin revived and I died." We are not, therefore, to murmur against God, as though by his means we were thus made sinful, but rather to take shame to ourselves that human nature has converted into instruments of sin those dispositions which God created in us to be used to his glory—those objects of delight which fill the world for our benefit.

It is not, then, man's nature that inclines man to sin, though it neither discerns, nor resists, nor appreciates it; but each actual transgression is a wilful offence of his own, and for it he is, therefore, justly accountable. There is a great difference between made to sin and being permitted to choose it; and this latter is our case. Sin rendered the law necessary, and every

offence against the law is sin. It has filled the world with temptations to transgress, and has deprived us of the strength to resist them. It has put obstacles in the way of righteousness, and has effaced from our minds that vivid perception of God's will, that clear view of moral danger, which can enable us to walk in that way. It appears, then, from a review of the subject, that original sin gives us up bound to the world, the flesh, and the devil; that by its more remote effects it created the temptations which surround us, and deprives us of the poor compensation which our good deeds could offer as a set-off against our evil ones; for we have seen that these very deeds partake of the nature of sin. Add to this, it perverts the affections and corrupts the imagination, till guilt comes in like a flood, and the verdict of the Eternal is, "There is none that doeth good; no, not one."

Original sin, then, in our case, is a *deprivation* rather than a *depravation*. It is a negative rather than a positive evil. It is a withdrawing from the mind of man its natural strength, and foresight, and clearness of understanding. The contrary notion, that, viz., of the Calvinists, adds no glory to God, while it does very much embarrass our ideas of the Gospel dispensation, by attributing to God, as Bishop Taylor well observes, acts of direct injustice. The principle for which the Church contends, recognizes the utter helplessness of human nature, the absolute impossibility of man saving himself, the necessity of a Divine Redeemer; and what more can be required even by the Calvinist? On the other hand, it asserts that man may and must co-operate effectually, though not meritoriously, with Christ in the work of his own salvation; which it commands him, in the words of St. Paul, to work out with fear and trembling.

The tract from Archbishop Sandys will not require any prefatory remarks, as the subject has been so frequently referred to in the prefaces to others; but we thought it well to give a short tract from the writings of a man who was so highly esteemed in his day, and whose works are not now attainable.

C.

CAMBRIDGE,

The Feast of King Charles's Restoration.

AN ESSAY ON ORIGINAL SIN.

EXTRACTED FROM THE WRITINGS OF

THE RIGHT REVEREND JEREMY TAYLOR, D.D.,

LORD BISHOP OF DOWN AND CONNOR.

Of Concupiscence and Original Sin ; and whether or no, or how far, we are bound to repent of it.

ORIGINAL sin is so called figuratively, meaning the sin of Adam, which was committed in the original of mankind by our first parent, and which hath influence upon all his posterity. “Nascuntur non propriè, sed originaliter, peccatores :” so St. Austin;* and therefore St. Ignatius calls it “the old impiety ;” † that which was in the original or first parent of mankind.

This sin brought upon Adam all that God threatened—but no more. A certainty of dying, together with the proper effects and affections of mortality, were inflicted on him ; and he was reduced to the condition of his own nature, and then begat sons and daughters in his own likeness—that is, in the proper temper and constitution of mortal men. For as God was not bound to give what he never promised, viz., an immortal duration and abode in this life ; so neither does it appear, in that angry intercourse that God had with Adam, that he took from him or us any of our natural perfections, but his graces only.

Man, being left in this state of pure naturals, could not, by his own strength, arrive to a supernatural end ; which was typified in his being cast out of Paradise, and the guarding of it with the flaming sword of a cherub : for eternal life, being an end above our natural proportion, cannot be acquired by any natural means. Neither Adam nor any of his posterity could, by any actions or holiness, obtain heaven by desert, or by any natural efficiency ; for it is a gift still, and it is “neque currentis, neque operantis—neither of him that runneth, nor of him that worketh,” but of God, who freely gives it to such persons

* De Civit. lib. xvi. c. 18.

† Epist. ad Trallian.

whom he, also by other gifts and graces, hath disposed towards the reception of it.

What gifts and graces, or supernatural endowments, God gave to Adam in his state of innocence, we know not—God hath nowhere told us; and of things unrevealed we commonly make wild conjectures. But, after his fall, we find no sign of anything but of a common man. And, therefore, as it was with him, so it is with us; our nature cannot go to heaven without the helps of the divine grace, so neither could his: and whether he had them or no, it is certain we have; receiving more by the second Adam than we did lose by the first: and the sons of God are now spiritual, which he never was, that we can find.

But concerning the sin of Adam, tragical things are spoken; it destroyed his original righteousness, and lost it to us for ever; it corrupted his nature, and corrupted ours; and brought upon him, and not him only, but on us also, who thought of no such thing, an inevitable necessity of sinning, making it as natural to us to sin as to be hungry, or to be sick and die: and the consequence of these things is saddest of all—we are born enemies of God, sons of wrath, and heirs of eternal damnation.

In the meditation of these sad stories, I shall separate the certain from the uncertain, that which is revealed from that which is presumed, that which is reasonable from that which makes too bold reflections upon God's honour, and the reputation of his justice and his goodness. I shall do it in the words of the apostle, from whence men commonly dispute in this question, right or wrong, according as it happens.

“By one man sin came into the world.”* That sin entered into the world by Adam is therefore certain, because he was the first man; and unless he had never sinned, it must needs enter by him; for it comes in first by the first, “and death by sin;” that is, death, which at first was the condition of nature, became a punishment upon that account; just as it was to the serpent to creep upon his belly, and to the woman to be subject to her husband. These things were so before, and would have been so; for the apostle, pressing the duty of subjection, gives two reasons why the woman was to obey. One of them only was derived from this sin, the other was the prerogative of creation; for “Adam was first formed, then Eve:”† so that before her fall she was to have been subject to her husband, because she was later in being; she was a minor, and therefore under subjection; she was also the weaker vessel. But it had not been a curse; and if any of them had been hindered by grace and

* Rom. v. 12.

† 1 Tim. ii. 13.

favour, by God's anger they were now left to fall back to the condition of their nature.

"Death passed upon all men;" that is, upon all the old world, who were drowned in the flood of the divine vengeance, and who did sin after the similitude of Adam. And therefore St. Paul adds that for the reason: "Inasmuch as all men have sinned." If all men have sinned upon their own account (as it is certain they have), then these words can very well mean that Adam first sinned, and all his sons and daughters sinned after him, and so died in their own sin, by a death which, at first and in the whole constitution of affairs, is natural, and a death which their own sins deserved, but yet which was hastened or ascertained upon them the rather for the sin of their progenitor. Sin propagated upon that root and vicious example; or rather from that beginning, not from that cause, but "*dum ita peccant, et similiter moriuntur*—if they sin so, then so shall they die:" so St. Jerome.

But this is not thought sufficient, and men do usually affirm that we are formally and properly made sinners by Adam, and in him we all by interpretation sinned, and therefore think these words, "forasmuch as all men have sinned," ought to be expounded thus—"Death passed upon all men, in whom all men have sinned;" meaning, that in Adam we really sinned, and God does truly and justly impute his sin to us, to make us as guilty as he that did it, and as much punished, and liable to eternal damnation.

But supposing all that can be, and that it did signify "in whom," yet the sense were fair enough as to the whole article; for "by him," or "in him, we are made sinners;" that is, brought to an evil state of things usually consequent to sinners. We are used like sinners "by him," or "in him;" just as when a sinner is justified he is treated like a righteous person, as if he had never sinned, though he really did sin oftentimes; and this for his sake who is made righteousness to us: so "in Adam we are made sinners;" that is, treated ill and afflicted, though ourselves be innocent of that sin which was the occasion of our being used so severely for other sins, of which we were not innocent. But how this came to pass, is told in the following words.

"For until the law, sin was in the world; but sin is not imputed when there is no law. Nevertheless, death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression, who is the figure of him that was to come." * By which discourse it appears that St. Paul

* Rom. v. 13, 14.

does not speak of all mankind, as if the evil occasioned by Adam's sin did descend for ever upon that account; but it had a limited effect, and reached only to those who were in the interval between Adam and Moses. This death was brought upon them by Adam; that is, death, which was threatened to Adam only, went forth upon them also who indeed were sinners, but "not after the similitude of Adam's transgression;" that is, who sinned not so capitally as he did. For to sin like Adam is used as a tragical and a high expression. So it is in the prophet: "They like *men* have transgressed;" * so we read it: but in the Hebrew it is, "They like *Adam* have transgressed:" and yet death passed upon them that did not sin after the similitude of Adam; for Abel, and Seth, and Abraham, and all the patriarchs died, Enoch only excepted; and therefore it was no wonder that, upon the sin of Adam, death entered upon the world, who generally sinned like Adam, since it passed on, and reigned upon, less sinners. It reigned upon them whose sins, therefore, would not be so imputed as Adam's was; because there was no law with an express threatening given to them as was to Adam: but although it was not wholly imputed upon their own account, yet it was imputed upon theirs and Adam's. For God was so exasperated with mankind, that, being angry, he would still continue that punishment, even to the lesser sins and sinners, which he only had first threatened to Adam: and so Adam brought it upon them. They, indeed, in rigour, did themselves deserve it; but if it had not been for that provocation by Adam, they who sinned not so bad, and had not been so severely and expressly threatened, had not suffered so severely. The case is this. Jonathan and Michal were Saul's children; it came to pass that seven of Saul's issue were to be hanged, all equally innocent, equally culpable. David took the five sons of Michal, for she had left him unhandsomely. Jonathan was his friend, and therefore he spared his son Mephibosheth. Here it was indifferent, as to the guilt of the persons, whether David should take the sons of Michal or of Jonathan; but it is likely that as, upon the kindness which David had to Jonathan, he spared his son, so, upon the just provocation of Michal, he made that evil to fall upon them, of which they were otherwise capable; which, it may be, they should not have suffered if their mother had been kind. Adam was to God as Michal to David.

But there was in it a further design; for by this dispensation of death, Adam was made a figure of Christ: so the apostle

* Hos. vi. 7

expressly affirms, "who is the figure of him that was to come;" that as death passed upon the posterity of Adam, though they sinned less than Adam, so life should be given to the followers of Christ, though they were imperfectly righteous—that is, not after the similitude of Christ's perfection.

But for the further clearing the article depending upon the right understanding of these words, these two things are observable. 1. That the evil of death descending upon Adam's posterity, for his sake went no further than till Moses: for after the giving of Moses's law, death passed no further upon the account of Adam's transgression; but by the sanction of Moses's law, where death was anew, distinctly and expressly threatened as it was to Adam, and so went forward upon a new score, but introduced first by Adam—that is, he was the cause at first; and till Moses, also, he was in some sense the author, and for ever after the precedent; and therefore the apostle said well, "In Adam we all die:" his sin brought in the sentence, in him it began, and from him it passed upon all the world, though by several dispensations. 2. In the discourse of the apostle, those that were named were not considered simply as born from Adam, and therefore it did not come upon the account of natural or original corruption, but they were considered as sinners; just as they who have life by Christ are not considered as merely children by title, or spiritual birth and adoption, but as just and faithful. But then this is the proportion and purpose of the apostle; as God gives to these life by Christ, which is a greater thing than their imperfect righteousness without Christ could have expected, so here also: this part of Adam's posterity was punished with death for their own sin; but this death was brought upon them by Adam—that is, the rather for his provocation of God by his great transgression.

There is now remaining no difficulty but in the words of the nineteenth verse, "By one man's disobedience many were made sinners." Concerning which I need not make use of the word "many," whom sometimes St. Paul calls "all," and "many;" that is, "all" from Adam to Moses; but they are but "many," and not "all," in respect of mankind; exactly answering to the "all" that have life by Christ, which are only those "many that believe," and are adopted into the covenant of believers. By this, indeed, it is perceivable, that this was not a natural title or derivation of an inherent corruption from Adam, for that must have included "all" absolutely and universally. But that which I here dwell and rely upon is this:

Sin is often in Scripture used for the punishment of sin; and they that suffer are called sinners, though they be innocent.

So it is in this case. "By Adam's disobedience many were made sinners;" that is, the sin of Adam passed upon them, and sat upon their heads with evil effect, like that of Bathsheba: "I and my son shall be accounted sinners;" * that is, evil will befall us, we shall be used like sinners, like traitors and usurpers. So, "This shall be the *sin* of Egypt," said the prophet: † this shall be the *punishment*; so we read it. And Cain, complaining of the greatness of his punishment, said, "Mine iniquity is greater than I can bear." And to put it past all doubt, not only punishment is called sin in Scripture, but even he that bears it. "Him that knew no sin, God hath made sin, that we might be the righteousness of God in him." ‡ And the prophet Isaiah, speaking of Christ, saith, "He hath made his soul a sin;" § that is, obnoxious to the punishment of sin. Thus it is said that "Christ shall appear the second time without sin"—that is, without the punishment of sin—"unto salvation: || for of sin, formally or materially, he was at first as innocent as at the second time; that is, pure in both. And if Christ, who bare our burden, became sin for us in the midst of his purest innocence, that we also are by Adam made sinners, that is, suffer evil by occasion of his demerit, infers not that we have any formal guilt, or enmity against God upon that account. In St. Paul, "By Adam we are made sinners," answers, both in the story and in the expression, to "Christus factus peccatum pro nobis—Christ was made sin for us;" that is, was exposed to the evil that is consequent to sin, viz., to its punishment.

For the further explication of which, it is observable that the word "sinner," and "sin," in Scripture is used for any person that hath a fault or a legal impurity, a debt, a vitiosity, defect, or imperfection. For the Hebrews use the word for any obligation which is contracted by the law without our fault. Thus a Nazarite, who had touched a dead body, was tied to offer a sacrifice "for sin;" and the reason is added, that is, "he had sinned concerning the dead body;" and yet it was nothing but a legal impurity, nothing moral. And the offering that was made by the leprous, or the menstruous, or the diseased, "in profluvio seminis," is called "an offering for sin," and yet it might be innocent all the way.

Thus in the Epistle to the Hebrews it is said, that our blessed Lord, who is compared to the high priest among the Jews, did "offer first for his own sins;" ¶ by which word it is certain that no sin properly could be meant, for Christ knew no sin: but

* 1 Kings i. 21.
§ Isa. liii. 10.

† Zech. xiv. 19.
|| Heb. ix. 28.

‡ 2 Cor. v. 21.
¶ Heb. vii. 27.

it means, the state of his infirmity, the condition of his mortal body, which he took for us and our sins, and is a state of misery and of distance from heaven; "for flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of heaven;" whither Christ was not to go, till, by offering himself, he had unclothed himself of that imperfect vesture, as they that were legally impure might not go to the temple before their offering: and therefore, when by death he quit himself of this condition, it is said "he died unto sin." * Parallel to this is that of St. Paul in the fifth chapter † to the Romans, where the state of infirmity is expressly called sin. The high priest "is himself also compassed with infirmity; and by reason hereof he ought, as for the people, so also for himself, to offer for sins." This is also more expressly by St. Paul called "the likeness of the sin of the flesh;" ‡ and thus concupiscence, or the first motions and inclinations to sin, is called sin, and said to have the nature of sin; that is, "the likeness," it may be, the material part "of sin," or something by which sin is commonly known. And thus Origen observes, that an oblation was to be offered, even for new-born children, "as if they were not clean from sin." But this, being a usual expression among the Hebrews, bears its sense upon the palm of the hand, and signifies only the legal impurity in which the new-born babes and their mothers were involved. Even Christ himself, who had no original sin, was subject to this purification. So we read in St. Luke: § and "when the days of *her* purification were accomplished:" but in most books, and particularly in the King's MS., it is read, "the days of *their* purification." But the things of this nature being called offerings for sins, and the expression usual among the Jews, I doubt not but hath given occasion to the Christian writers to fancy other things than were intended.

Having now explicated those words of St. Paul, which, by being misunderstood, have caused strange devices in this article, we may now, without prejudice, examine what really was the effect of Adam's sin, and what evil descended upon his posterity.

Adam's sin was punished by an expulsion out of Paradise, in which was a tree appointed to be the cure of diseases and a conservatory of life. There was no more told as done but this, and its proper consequents. He came into a land less blessed, a land which bore thistles and briars easily, and fruits with difficulty, so that he was forced to sweat hard for his bread; and this also—I cannot say did descend, but must needs be a condition

* Rom. vi. 10.

† Rom. vi. 2, 3.

‡ Rom. viii. 3.

§ Luke ii. 22.

of his children who were left to live so, and in the same place; just as when young Antony had seized upon Marcus Cicero's land, the son also lost what he never had. And thus death came in, not by any new sentence or change of nature; for man was created mortal, and if Adam had not sinned he should have been immortal by grace; that is, by the use of the tree of life: and now being driven from the place where the tree grew, was left in its own natural constitution; that is, to be sick and die without that remedy. "He was mortal of himself, and we are mortal from him." * "Peccando Adam posteris mortis subiecit, et universos huic delicto obnoxios reddit," said Justin Martyr: "Adam by his sin made all his posterity liable to the sin, and subjected them to death." † One explicates the other; and therefore St. Cyprian calls original sin, ‡ "His sin infected us with death, and this infection we derive in our birth;" § that is, we are born mortal. Adam's sin was imputed to us unto a natural death; in him we are sinners, as in him we die. But this sin is not real and inherent, but imputed only to such a degree. So St. Cyprian affirms most expressly: || "An infant hath not sinned, save only that, being carnally born of Adam, in his first birth he hath contracted the contagion of the old death."

This evil, which is the condition of all our natures, viz., to die, was to some a punishment, but to others not so. It was a punishment to all that sinned both before Moses and since: upon the first it fell as a consequent of God's anger upon Adam (as I before discoursed); upon the latter it fell as a consequent of that anger which was threatened in Moses's law. But to those who sinned not at all, as infants and innocents, it was merely a condition of their nature, and no more a punishment than to be a child is. It was a punishment of Adam's sin, because by his sin human nature became disrobed of their preternatural immortality, and therefore upon that account they die; but, as it related to the persons, it was not a punishment, not an evil afflicted for their sin, or any guiltiness of their own, properly so called.

We find nothing else in Scripture expressed to be the effect of Adam's sin; and beyond this, without authority, we must not go. Other things are said, but I find no warrant for them in

* Cyril. adv. Anthrop.

† Dial. adv. Tryph.

‡ "Malum domesticum, contagium mortis antiquæ prima nativitate contractum."

§ Lib. iii. Ep. 8.

|| "Infans recens natus nihil peccavit, nisi quòd, secundum Adam carnalitèr natus, contagium mortis antiquæ primâ nativitate contraxit."

that sense they are usually supposed, and some of them in no sense at all. The particulars commonly reckoned are, that from Adam we derive an original ignorance, a proneness to sin, a natural malice, a “fomes,” or nest of sin imprinted and placed in our souls; a loss of our will’s liberty, and nothing is left but a liberty to sin; which liberty, upon the sum of affairs, is expounded to be a necessity to sin: and the effect of all is, we are born heirs of damnation.

Concerning original or natural ignorance, it is true we derive it from our parents—I mean, we are born with it; but I do not know that any man thinks that, if Adam had not sinned that sin, Cain should have been wise as soon as his navel had been cut. Neither can we guess at what degree of knowledge Adam had before his fall. Certainly, if he had so great a knowledge, it is not likely he would so cheaply have sold himself and all his hopes, out of a greedy appetite to get some knowledge. But concerning his posterity; indeed it is true a child cannot speak at first, nor understand: and if, as Plato said, “all our knowledge is nothing but memory,” it is no wonder a child is born without knowledge. But so it is in the wisest men in the world; they also, when they see or hear a thing first, think it strange, and could not know it till they saw or heard it. Now this state of ignorance we derive from Adam, as we do our nature, which is a state of ignorance and all manner of imperfection: but whether it was not imperfect, and apt to fall into forbidden instances even before his fall, we may best guess at by the event; for if he had not had a rebellious appetite, and an inclination to forbidden things, by what could he have been tempted, and how could it have come to pass that he should sin? Indeed, this nature was made worse by sin, and became divested of whatsoever it had extraordinary, and was left naked and mere; and therefore it is not only an original imperfection which we inherit, but in the sense now explicated it is also an original corruption. And this is all: as natural death by his sin became a curse, so our natural imperfection became natural corruption, and that is original sin. Death and imperfection we derive from Adam, but both were natural to us; but by him they became actual and penal, and by him they became worse, as by every evil act every principle of evil is improved. And in this sense this article is affirmed by all the doctors of the ancient Church. We are miserable really, sinners in account or effect; that properly, this improperly; and are fallen into so sad a state of things, which we also every day make worse, that we did need a Saviour to redeem us from it: for in original sin we are to consider the principle, and the effects. The principle

is the actual sin of Adam. This being to certain purposes by God's absolute dominion imputed to us, hath brought upon us a necessity of dying, and all the affections of mortality, which, although they were natural, yet would by grace have been hindered. Another evil there is upon us, and that is concupiscence: this also is natural, but it was actual before the fall; it was in Adam, and tempted him. This also from him is derived to us, and is by many causes made worse, by him and by ourselves. And this is the whole state of original sin, so far as is fairly warrantable. But for the other particulars the case is wholly differing.

The sin of Adam neither made us, first, heirs of damnation, nor, secondly, naturally and necessarily vicious.

It could not make us heirs of damnation. This I shall the less need to insist upon, because, of itself, it seems so horrid to impute to the goodness and justice of God to be author of so great a calamity to innocents, that St. Austin's followers have generally left him in that point, and have descended to this lesser proportion, that original sin damns only to the eternal loss of the sight of God's glorious face. But to this I say these things.

1. There are many divines which believe this alone to be the worm that never dies, and the fire that never goeth out; that is, in effect, this, and the anguish for this, is all the hell of the damned. And unless infants remain infants in the resurrection too (which no man that I know affirms), or unless they be senseless and inapprehensive, it is not to be imagined but that all that know they are, by way of punishment, deprived of the glorious face of God, must needs have a horrible anguish of soul to eternal ages. And this argument, besides the reasonableness of the thing, hath warrant from the words of St. Austin.* Here the good man and eloquent, suppose the little babes to be innocent, to be images of God, to love the kingdom of God, and yet to be sentenced to hell: which, it may be, he did, but I do not, understand; save only that, in the parable, we find Dives in hell to be very charitable to his living brethren. But that which I make use of for the present is, that infants, besides the loss of God's presence and the beholding his face, are apprehensive and afflicted with that evil state of things, whither their infelicity, not their fault, hath carried them.

* "*Si hoc eis non erit malum, non ergo amabunt regnum Dei tot innocentes imagines Dei? Si autem amabunt, et tantum amabunt, quantum innocentes amare debent, regnum ejus, à quo ad ipsius imaginem creantur, nihilne mali de hâc ipsâ separatione patientur?*"—(Lib. vi. in Julian., c. 4).

2. But suppose this to be but a mere privative state, yet it cannot be inflicted upon infants as a punishment of Adam's sin; and upon the same account it cannot be inflicted upon any one else. Not upon infants, because they are not capable of a law for themselves; therefore, much less of a law which was given to another, here being a double incapacity of obedience. They cannot receive any law; and if they could, yet of this they never were offered any notice, till it was too late. Now if infants be not capable of this, nor chargeable with it, then no man is; for all are infants first; and if it comes not first by birth, and at first, it cannot come at all. So that although this privative hell be less than to say they are tormented in flames besides, yet it is as unequal and unjust. There is not, indeed, the same cruelty, but there is the same injustice. I deny not but all persons naturally are so, that they cannot arrive at heaven; but, unless some other principle be put into them, or some great grace done for them, must for ever stand separate from seeing the face of God. But this is but accidentally occasioned by the sin of Adam. That left us in our natural state, and that state can never come to heaven in its own strength. But this condition of all men by nature is not the punishment of our sin; for this would suppose, that were it not for this sin superinduced, otherwise we should go to heaven. Now this is not true; for if Adam had not sinned, yet without something supernatural, some grace and gift, we could never go to heaven. Now although the sin of Adam left him in his nakedness, and a mere natural man, yet presently this was supplied, and we were never in it, but were improved and bettered by the promise, and Christ hath died for mankind, and in so doing is become our Redeemer and representative; and therefore this sin of Adam cannot call us back from that state of good things, into which we are put by the mercies of God in our Lord Jesus; and therefore now no infant or idiot, or man or woman, shall, for this alone, be condemned to an eternal banishment from the sweetest presence of God. But this will be evinced more certainly in the following periods: for if they stand for ever banished from the presence of God, then they shall be for ever shut up in hell, with the devil and his angels; for the Scripture hath mentioned no portions but of the right and left hand. Gregory Nazianzen and his scholiast Nicetas did suppose that there should be a middle state between heaven and hell for infants and heathens; and concerning infants, Pope Innocent III. and some schoolmen * have taken it up: but

* Ambr. Cathar. Albert. Pighius.

St. Austin * hath sufficiently confuted it ; and it is sufficient that there is no ground for it but their own dreams.

3. But, then, against those that say the flames of hell are the portion of Adam's heirs, and that infants dying in original sin are eternally tormented, as Judas, or Dives, or Julian—I call to witness all the economy of the divine goodness, and justice, and truth. “The soul that sins, it shall die; as I live, saith the Lord, the son shall not bear the iniquity of the father;” † that is, he shall not be guilty of his crime, nor liable to his punishment.

4. Is hell so easy a pain, or are the souls of children of so cheap, so contemptible a price, that God should so easily throw them into hell? God's goodness, which pardons many sins which we could avoid, will not so easily throw them into hell for what they could not avoid. God's goodness is against this.

5. It is supposed that Adam did not finally perish for that sin which himself committed; all antiquity thought so, Tatianus only excepted, who was a heretic accounted, and the father of the Encratites. But, then, what equity is it that any innocents or little children should?—for either God pardoned Adam or condemned him. If he pardoned him that sinned, it is not so agreeable to his goodness to exact it of others that did not. ‡ For if he pardoned him, then either God took off all that to which he was liable, or only removed it from him to place it somewhere else. If he removed it from him to his posterity, that is it which we complain of as contrary to his justice and his goodness. But if God took off all that was due, how could God exact it of others, it being wholly pardoned? But if God did not pardon him the eternal guilt, but took the forfeiture and made him pay the full price of his sin; that is, all which he did threaten and intend; then it is not to be supposed that God should, in justice, demand more than eternal pains as the price to be paid by one man for one sin. So that in all senses this seems unjust.

6. To be born, was a thing wholly involuntary and unchosen, and therefore it could in no sense be chosen, that we were born so; that is, born guilty of Adam's sin, which we knew not of, which was done so many thousand years before we were born; which we had never heard of, if God had not been pleased by a supernatural way to reveal to us; which the greatest part of mankind to this day have never heard of; at which we were

* De Verb. Apost., serm. xiv.

† Ezek. xviii.

‡ Ex tarditate si Dii sontes prætereant, et insontes plectant, justitiam suam non sic rectè resarciunt.

displeased as soon as we knew of it ; which hath caused much trouble to us, but never tempted us with any pleasure.

7. No man can perish for that of which he was not guilty ; but we could not be involved in the guilt, unless some way or other our consent had been involved. For it is no matter who sins, or who is innocent, if he that is innocent may perish for what another does without his knowledge or leave, either asked, or given, or presumed. But if our consent was in it, then either it was included naturally, or by an express will of God that made it so. It can no way be imagined how our will can be naturally included, for we had no natural being ; we had no life, and therefore no action, and therefore no consent. For it is impossible there should be an act of will in any sense, when there is an act of understanding in no sense. But if by a divine act or decree it became so, and not by our act, then we only are said to consent, because God would have it so ; which, if we speak intelligibly, is to charge God with making us guilty when we were not ; to say, we consented when we did not.

8. In pursuance of which argument, I consider, that whatsoever can be said to consent, must have a being either in or out of its causes. But our will was not in being or actual existence when Adam sinned ; it was then in its causes : but the soul, and so the will of man, hath no cause but God, it being with the soul immediately created. If, therefore, we sinned, we could not sin in ourselves, for we were not born ; nor could we sin in Adam, for he was not the cause of our will ; it must, therefore, be, that we sinned in God : for as was our being, so must our action be. But our being was then only in God ; our will and our soul were in him only—“*tanquam in suâ causâ* ;” therefore in him was our action, our consent, or what we please to call it. Which affirmative, what sense, or what piety, or what probability, it can have in it, I suppose, needs not much enquiry.

9. To condemn infants to hell for the fault of another, is to deal worse with them than God did to the very devils, who did not perish but for an act of their own most perfect choice.

10. This, besides the formality of injustice and cruelty, does add and suppose a circumstance of a strange, ungentle contrivance. For, because it cannot be supposed that God should damn infants or innocents without cause, it finds out this way, that God, to bring his purposes to pass, should create a guilt for them, or bring them into an inevitable condition of being guilty by a way of his inventing.* For if he did make any such

* Qui vult aliquid in causâ, vult effectum ex istâ causâ profluentem.

agreement with Adam, he beforehand knew that Adam would forfeit all, and therefore that unavoidably all his posterity should be surprised. This is to make pretences, and to invent justifications and reasons of his proceedings, which, indeed, are all one as if they were not. For he that can make a reason for an action otherwise unjust, can do it without any reason; especially when the reason itself makes the misery as fatal as a decree without a reason: and if God cannot be supposed to damn infants without just cause, and therefore he so ordered it that a cause should not be wanting, but he infallibly and irresistibly made them guilty of Adam's sin; is not this to resolve to make them miserable, and then with scorn to triumph in their sad condition? For if they could not deserve to perish without a fault of their own, how could they deserve to have such a fault put upon them? If it be unjust to damn them without cause, is it not also unjust to make a cause for them, whether they will or no?

11. It is supposed, and generally taught, that before the fall Adam had original righteousness; that is, not only that he was as innocent as children new-born are of actual sin (which seems to be that which divines call "original righteousness," there being no other either taught or reasonable), but a rare rectitude of the inner man, a just subordination of the inferior faculties to the superior, an excellent knowledge and clear light: and therefore that he would sin had so little excuse, that well it might deserve such a punishment, so great as himself suffered. Indeed, if he had no such rare perfections and rectitude, I can say nothing to the particular; but to the question this—that if Adam had it not, then he could not lose it, nor his posterity after him; as it is fiercely and mightily pretended that they did. But if he had this rectitude add rare endowments, what equity is it that his posterity, who had no such helps to resist the sin, and were so far from having any helps at all to resist it, that they had no notice of it, neither of the law, nor the danger, nor the temptation, nor the action, till it was past? I say, what equity is it that his posterity should, in the midst of all these imperfections, be equally punished with him, who sinned against so great a light and so mighty helps?

12. Infants cannot justly perish for Adam's sin, unless it be just that their wills should be included in his will, and his will justly become theirs by interpretation. Now if so, I ask whether, before that sin of Adam, were our wills free or not free? For if we had any will at all, it must be free or not free. If we had none at all, how could it be involved in his? Now if our wills were free, why are they, without our act, and whether we

will or no, involved in the will of another? If they were not free, how could we be guilty? If they were free, then they could also dissent. If they were not free, then they could not consent: and so, either they never had, or else, before Adam's fall, they lost, their liberty.

13. But if it be enquired seriously, I cannot imagine what can be answered. Could we prevent the sin of Adam? Could we hinder it? Were we ever asked? Could we, if we had been asked, after we were born a month, have given our negative? Or could we do more before we were born than after? Were we, or could we be, tied to prevent that sin? Did not God know that we could not in that case dissent? And why, then, shall our consent be taken in by interpretation, when our dissent could not be really acted; but if at that time we could not dissent really, could we have dissented from Adam's sin by interpretation? If not, then we could dissent no way, and then it was inevitably decreed that we should be ruined; for neither really, nor by interpretation, could we have dissented. But if we could by interpretation have dissented, it were certainly more agreeable to God's goodness to have interpreted for us in the better sense, rather than in the worse; being we did neither, really and actually; and if God had so pleased, he rather might with his goodness have interpreted us to have dissented, than he could with justice have interpreted us to have consented: and, therefore, certainly he did so, or would have done, if there had been need.

14. Lastly, the consequent of these is this: that because God is true, and just, and wise, and good, and merciful, it is not to be supposed that he will snatch infants from their mothers' breasts, and throw them into the everlasting flames of hell for the sin of Adam; that is, as to them, for their mere natural state, of which himself was author and creator: that is, he will not damn them for being good. For "God saw every thing that he had made, and behold it was very good:" and, therefore, so is that state of descent from Adam. God is the author of it, and therefore it cannot be ill. It cannot be contrary to God, because it is his work.

Upon the account of these reasons I suppose it safe to affirm, that God does not damn any one to hell merely for the sin of our first father, which I sum up in the words of St. Ambrose,* or whoever is the author of the commentaries upon the Epistles

* "Mors autem dissolutio corporis est, cum anima à corpore separatur. Est et alia mors, quæ secunda dicitur, in gehennâ, quam non peccato Adæ patimur, sed ejus occasione propriis peccatis acquiritur."

of St. Paul attributed to him : " Death is the dividing soul and body. There is also another death, which is in hell, and is called the second death, which we do not suffer for the sin of Adam ; but, by occasion of it, we fall into it by our own sins." *

Next we are to enquire, whether or no it does not make us infallibly, naturally, and necessarily vicious, by taking from us original righteousness, by discomposing the order of our faculties, and enslaving the will to sin and folly, concerning which the enquiry must be made by parts.

For if the sin of Adam did debauch our nature, and corrupt our will and manners, it is either by a physical or natural efficiency of the sin itself ; or, secondly, because we were all in the loins of Adam ; or, thirdly, by the sentence and decree of God.

1. Not by any natural efficiency of the sin itself : because then it must be that every sin of Adam must spoil such a portion of his nature, that, before he died, he must be a very beast. Secondly : We also, by degeneration and multiplication of new sins, must have been at so vast a distance from him at the very worst, that by this time we should not have been so wise as a fly, nor so free and unconstrained as fire. Thirdly : If one sin would, naturally and by physical causality, destroy original righteousness, then every one sin in the regenerate can as well destroy habitual righteousness, because that and this differ not but in their principle, not in their nature and constitution. And why should not a righteous man as easily and as quickly fall from grace, and lose his habits, as Adam did ? Naturally it is all one. Fourthly : If that one sin of Adam did destroy all his righteousness, and ours too, then our original sin does more hurt, and is more punished, and is of greater malice, than our actual sin. For one act of sin does but lessen and weaken the habit, but does not quite destroy it. If, therefore, this act of Adam (in which, certainly, at least we did not offend maliciously) destroys all original righteousness, and a malicious act now does not destroy a righteous habit, it is better for us in our own malice, than in our ignorance, and we suffer less for doing evil that we know of, than for doing that which we knew nothing of.

2. If it be said that this evil came upon us because we all were in the loins of Adam, I consider, first, that then by the same reason we are guilty of all the sins which he ever committed while we were in his loins ; there being no imaginable reason why the first sin should be propagated, and not the rest ;

* In c. v. Rom.

and he might have sinned the second time, and have sinned worse. Add to this, that the later sins are commonly the worse, as being committed not only against the same law, but a greater reason, and a longer experience, and heightened by the mark of ingratitude, and deeply noted with folly, for venturing damnation so much longer: and then he that was born last should have most original sin; and Seth should, in his birth and nature, be worse than Abel, and Abel be worse than Cain. Secondly: Upon this account all the sins of all our progenitors will be imputed to us, because we were in their loins when they sinned them; and every lustful father must have a lustful son, and so every man, or no man, will be lustful. For if ever any man were lustful or intemperate when or before he begot his child, upon this reckoning his child will be so too, and then his grandchild, and so on for ever. Thirdly: Sin is seated in the will, it is an action, and transient; and when it dwells or abides, it abides nowhere but in the will by approbation and love, to which is naturally consequent a readiness in the inferior faculties to obey and act accordingly; and therefore sin does not infect our mere natural faculties, but the will only, and not that in the natural capacity, but in its moral only. Fourthly: And, indeed, to him that considers it, it will seem strange and monstrous, that a moral obliquity, in a single instance, should make an universal change in a natural suscipient, and in a natural capacity. When it is in nature impossible that any impression should be made but between those things that communicate in matter or capacity; and therefore, if this were done at all, it must be by a higher principle, by God's own act or sanction, and then should be referred to another principle, not this against which I am now disputing. Fifthly: No man can transmit a good habit, a grace, or a virtue, by natural generation; as a great scholar's son cannot be born with learning, and the child of a judge cannot upon his birthday give wise sentences; and Marcus, the son of Cicero, was not so good an orator as his father: and how can it be, then, that a naughty quality should be more apt to be disseminated than a good one, when it is not the goodness or the badness of a quality that hinders its dissemination, but its being an acquired and superinduced quality that makes it cannot descend naturally? Add to this, how can a bad quality, morally bad, be directly and regularly transmitted by an action morally good? And since neither God that is the Maker of all does aniss, and the father that begets sins not, and the child that is begotten cannot sin—by what conveyance can any positive evil be derived to the posterity? Sixthly: It is generally, nowadays especially, believed,

that the soul is immediately created, not generated, according to the doctrine of Aristotle, affirming "that the soul is from without, and is a divine substance;" * and therefore sin cannot descend by natural generation, or by our being in Adam's loins. And how can it be that the father, who contributes nothing to her production, should contribute to her pollution? That he who did not transmit life should transmit his sin? And yet if the soul were traduced from the parents, and begotten, yet sin could not descend, because it is not a natural, but a superinduced quality; and if it could, then it would follow that we should from every vicious father derive a proper original sin, besides the general. Seventhly: If in him we sinned, then it were but just that in him we should be punished: for as the sin is, so ought the punishment to be. But it were unjust, or at least it seems so, that he should sin for us, and we be punished for him; or that he should sin for us and for himself, and yet be punished for himself alone.

3. But if it be said that this happened because of the will and decree of God, then there is no more to be done but to look into the record, and see what God threatened and what he inflicted. He threatened death, and he inflicted it, with all its preparations and solemnities in men and women: hard labour in them both; which Chrysostom thus expresses: † "Adam falling, even they that did not eat of the tree were of him all born mortal." ‡ He and all his posterity were left in the mere natural state; that is, in a state of imperfection, in a state that was not sufficiently instructed and furnished with abilities in order to a supernatural end, whither God had secretly designed mankind. In this state he could never arrive at heaven, but that was to be supplied by other means; for this made it necessary that all should come to Christ, and is the great necessity for the baptism of infants, that they, being admitted to supernatural promises and assistances, may be lifted up to a state above their nature; not only to improve their present good, as the Pelagians affirmed—

"Tam dives verò hoc donum baptismatis esse,
Ut parvis etiam vitioque carentibus omni
Congruat, ut qui sunt geniti bene, sint meliores,
Naturæque bonum adjecto illustretur honore;"

but to take off that evil state of things whither, by occasion of

* Lib. ii. de gen. an.

† Ἐκείνου πεισόντος, καὶ οἱ μὴ φαρμόντες ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου, γεγόνασιν παρ' ἐκείνου πάντες θνητοί.

‡ In v. Rom.

the fall of Adam, they were devolved, and to give them new birth, adoption into Christ, and the seeds of a new nature ; so to become children of God and heirs of the promises, who, in their mere naturals, did inherit from Adam nothing but misery, and imperfection, and death.* But, secondly, it is not to be supposed that God did inflict any necessity of sinning upon Adam or his posterity, because, from that time even unto this, he by new laws hath required innocence of life, or repentance and holiness. For besides that it is a great testimony of the divine favour that God will still employ us, and exact more services of us, and that there is no other argument of joy to us in the world than that we are God's servants, and there can be no greater testimony that God is our God ; and that of this employing us in his service, there can be no greater evidence than the giving to us new laws : besides this, I say, if man could not obey, it is not consistent with the wisdom of God to require of man what he knows man cannot do ; nor with his justice, to punish that in man which he knows man cannot avoid.

But if it be objected that man had strengths enough in his first creation, but when in Adam he sinned, in him also he forfeited all his strengths ; and therefore his consequent disability, being his own fault, cannot be his excuse ; and to whatsoever laws God shall be pleased afterward to impose, he cannot plead his infirmity, because himself having brought it on himself, must suffer for it : it being just in God to exact the law of him, even where he is unable to keep it, because God once made him able, and he disabled himself ;—I answer many things.

First : That Adam had any more strengths than we have, and greater powers of nature, and by his fall lost them to himself and us, being part of the question, ought not to be pretended till it be proved. Adam was a man, as his sons are, and no more ; and God gave him strength enough to do his duty ; and God is as just and loving to us as to him, and hath promised “he will lay no more upon us than he will make us able to bear.” But, secondly, he that disables himself from doing his Lord service, if he does it on purpose that he may not serve him, may be punished for not doing all that which was imposed upon him, because that servant did choose his disability, that he might with some pretence refuse the service. He did dis-

* “Cælorum regnum sperate, hoc fonte renati ;
Non recipit felix vita semel genitos.
Insons esse volens isto mundare lavacro,
Seu patrio premeris crimine, seu proprio.”

So Nystus, in the verses written upon the fount of Constantine.

obey in all the following particulars, because, out of a resolution not to obey in those particulars, he made himself unable in the general. It is all one with the case of voluntary and affected ignorance. He that refuses knowledge lest he should understand his duty, and he that disables himself that he may not do it, may be punished not only for not doing it, but for making it impossible to be done. But that was not Adam's case, so far as we know; and it is certain it was not ours in the matter of his sin. Thirdly: But if he commits a fault which accidentally disables him—as if he eats too much, and be sick the next day, and fall into a fever, he may, indeed, and is justly punished for his gluttony; but he is not punishable for omitting that which in his present weakness he can noways perform. The reason is, because this disability was involuntary, and an evil accident; of itself a punishment of his sin, and therefore of itself not punishable: and this involuntariness is still the more notorious and certain, as the consequents are the more remote. Fourthly: No man can be answerable to God for the consequent of his sin, unless it be natural, foretold, or foreseen; but for the sin itself he is: and as for the consequents superinduced by God, he must suffer them, but not answer for them. For these, being in the hands of God, are not the works of men's hands; God hath effected it upon the sinner, he is the author of it, and by it he is directly glorified; and therefore, though by it the sinner is punished, yet for it he cannot be punished again. Fifthly: But that I may come to the case of the present argument. This measure and line of justice are most evident in laws to be imposed after the disability is contracted, and not foreseen before; concerning which, there can be no pretence of justice that the breach of them should be punished. If a law be already imposed, and a man by his fault loses those assistances, without which he could not keep the law, he may, nevertheless, in the rigour of justice, be punished for not keeping it, because the law was given him when he had strength, and he ought to have preserved it. For though he cannot be obliged to a new law to which he is not enabled, yet for his sin he shall not be disobliged from an old law to which he was enabled. Although God will not exceed his measures, or do wrong to a sinner, yet by his sin he shall receive no favour or immunity. But in laws to be imposed afterward, the case, I say, is otherwise: because the persons are not capable of any such law; and God, knowing they cannot perform them, cannot intend they should; and therefore cannot justly punish them for not doing that which himself did never heartily intend they should do, because he knew they could not. The instances will make

the matter to be confessed. Suppose a man, falling into drunkenness, should, by the divine judgment, fall lame; can God afterward exact it of him that he should leap and dance in public festivities, when he can neither go nor stand? If so, suppose yet further that by the divine judgment he should fall mad; is the madman capable of a new law? I suppose it will not be said he is: or if it be, suppose yet further that he be taken speechless, and senseless, or die; can God still exact of him obedience to any new commandment? If he be dead, his day is done, he can work no more, nor be obliged any more: and so it is if he be mad, or any ways disabled; the case is all one. For whatsoever the disability be, the incapacity, and impossibility, and the excuse, are the same. Sixthly: When God, as it is said, punished the first sin with a consequent disability of doing any future services, if he also punishes the not doing what he afterward imposes, I ask, whether this later punishment be precisely due to the later or to the former sin? If to the later, then in vain is it laid upon the former account; and yet, if it be laid upon its own, it is high injustice, because of this law the man was not a subject capable when it was imposed—the man was dead before the law was alive: and a tree is as much capable of a law, as a man is of an impossible commandment. But if the punishment of this later be inflicted upon the sinner for the first transgression by which he disabled himself, then in vain was the later commandment imposed. For since the later sin was unavoidable, and the first sin deserved the whole damnation, what end could there be of imposing this new law, by which God could not serve any new purpose, no, not for the manifestation of his justice in condemning him? For if the first sin deserved condemnation, there was no need to introduce a new pretence, and to seek an occasion to slay him; but if it did not, it is certain the new sin could not make it just to do what was not just before, because by this new omission there can be no new guilt contracted. But of this I shall give yet a further account, when I shall discourse in what sense God can be said to punish one sin with another.

The consequent of the parts of this discourse is this—that since the sin of Adam did not debauch our nature by any natural efficiency of the sin itself, nor by our being in the loins of Adam, nor yet by any sentence or decree of God, we are not by Adam's sin made necessarily and naturally vicious, and inclined to evil, but are left in our mere nature, such as it was, and such as it is.*

* Idem sensit Jacobus Faber in v. Rom. Nihil nos ex Adamo trahere nisi obligationem ad mortem. Albertus Pighius Controv. de

——— “Nec si miserum [Natura] Sinonem
Finxit, vanum etiam mendacemque improba finget.” *

Nature makes us miserable and imperfect, but not criminal. “If any man be a pious and a good man, he is of God; if he be impious, he is of the devil: not by nature, but made so by his own proceedings.” † To all which I add this—

That in Scripture there is no signification of any corruption or deprivation of our souls by Adam’s sin, which I shall manifest by examination of all those places which are the pretence of the contrary doctrine. For if God hath not declared in Scripture any such thing, we have the common notions of his justice, and wisdom, and goodness, and truth, in prejudice of the contrary.

Peccato Orig. et Ambr. Catharinus de Lapsu Hominis et Peccato Orig. statuunt, peccatum originis non habere veram peccati rationem, sed esse tantum reatum, quo posteri primorum parentum propter transgressionem illorum primævam, sine aliquo vitio proprio et inhærente, naturæ pravitate devincti teneantur.

* Æn. ii.

† Ἐὰν εὐσεβῇ τις ἄνθρωπος, Θεοῦ ἐστίν • ἐὰν δὲ ἀσεβῇ τις ἄνθρωπος, τοῦ διαβόλου οὐκ ἀπὸ τῆς φύσεως, ἀλλ’ ἀπὸ τῆς ἐαυτοῦ γνώμης γινόμενος.
They are the words of St. Ignatius the martyr.

UNWRITTEN TRADITION.

BY THE

MOST REV FATHER IN GOD, EDWYN SANDYS, D.D.,

LORD ARCHBISHOP OF YORK.

“WHEREFORE do ye lay out your silver for that which is no bread, and your labour on that which is not to satisfy?” As before he exhorted us to come and buy freely without money, because God is no money-man, neither can any man deserve favour at his hands, but whatsoever we have of him, we have it of mercy; so now he sharply reproveth all such as by money or merchandize, by desert or merit, seek after salvation. He doth horteth us from false teachers, crafty seducers, which offer to sell the grace and mercy of God for money. Christ proposeth his heavenly treasures, remission of sins, justification, sanctification, mercy, grace, and salvation, freely. He that sitteth in the temple of God, and termeth himself Christ’s Vicar, doth in like sort offer unto the people bread, water, wine, milk, pardon of sins, grace, mercy, and eternal life; but not freely: he is a merchant, he giveth nothing, and that is nothing which he selleth. For, although he make large promises to the buyer, he selleth that which he hath not to deliver. “Eternal life is the gift of God.” The Pope, therefore, selleth but wind and smoke for fire, shadows for truths; he deceiveth the buyers with false sleights, false measures, false weights: beware of this merchant, lose not your labour, cast not away your money; it is not meat, but poison which he offereth you. His physic cannot heal your diseases; his holy water cannot wash away the spots of a sullied and defiled soul, as he untruly would bear you in hand; his blasphemous masses do not appease, but provoke God’s wrath; they cannot benefit the quick, much less the dead, which either need no help, or are past all help; his rotten relics cannot comfort you; his blind, dumb, and worm-eaten idols can do you no good. It is cast away which is spent upon his shameless pardons; they will not prevail—God will not admit them: by his Latin service ye cannot be edified, or made wiser. Yet

this trumpery they sell for money, and upon this trash they cause silly men to waste their substance, and to these to commit their souls. Thus you see a manifest difference between Christ and Antichrist, the doctrine of God and the learning of man, true teachers and false, sound and counterfeited religion. The one offereth true bread freely: the other, that which is no bread, for bread, and that not freely neither, but for money. The diversity of religion professed in these our times is here most plainly and lively depainted. For the better clearing whereof, I will in three notes lay before your eyes the whole difference which is between them.

First, we disagree in the very foundation. They lay one ground, and we another. We lay no one stone but only upon that foundation of the prophets and the apostles, whereupon whosoever is builded, groweth into an holy temple in the Lord—a temple which no wind, no waves, no storm, no tempest is able to overthrow. The foundation of our religion is the written word, the Scriptures of God, the undoubted records of the Holy Ghost. We require no credit to be given to any part or parcel of our doctrine, further than the same may be clearly and manifestly proved by the plain words of the law of God, which remaineth in writing, to be seen, read, and examined of all men. This we do, first, because we know that God hath caused his whole law to be written; secondly, because we see that it hath been the practice of all the defenders of the truth since the beginning to rely their faith only upon the Scripture and written word; thirdly, because it is evident and plain that we cannot receive any other foundation of heavenly truth, without the overthrow of Christian faith.

There was never any law-maker so simple as to make statutes for perpetuity, and not to register them in books, or engrave them in tables. When Memucan was desirous to have a law made for the bringing of women in subjection under their husbands, his persuasion was this—"If it may please the king, let a royal decree proceed from him, and let it be written." The laws of the Medes and Persians, that might never be altered, were for ever recorded. When God delivered his first law unto his people, the law which commonly we call moral, he gave it them written in tables of stone. Again, when he delivered them civil ordinances for the administration of justice between man and man, Moses first proclaimed all those laws and ordinances amongst the people; afterward he took and wrote in a book all the words of the Lord. As for the laws of rites and ceremonies, they are likewise written in this book. To these we must add that law, which the blessed apostle doth call the

“law of faith.” This law God preached unto Adam by himself—“The seed of the woman shall break the serpent’s head :” unto Abraham by his angel—“In thee shall all the nations of the earth be blessed :” to the children of Abraham by his prophets—“Behold, a virgin shall conceive and bear a Son :” finally, unto us by his Son, and by them whom his Son hath sent into the world to make it known—“That through this man is preached remission of sins, and from all things from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses : by him every one that believeth is justified.” And the statutes of this law are also written. God, being moreover desirous to have his servants not only taught by doctrine, but provoked also by examples, gave them a fifth sort of laws and testimonies, called historical ; not leaving these neither to men, to deliver unto their children by word of mouth, but all by writing. If God have committed his laws, moral, civil, ceremonial, evangelical, and historical also, unto writing, where should we seek for the statutes of the Almighty but in his written word ?

The ancients of the house of God knew no fountain of his truth but this ; they never enquired what had been whispered in men’s ears : that which they believed and taught, they read it out of *the book*. In the history of Joshua, it is recorded how he did assemble the tribes, elders, heads, judges, and officers of Israel together, showing them what God had spoken unto them by Moses, but uttering to them no speech which was not written. Josias, with all the men of Judah, and all the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the priests, prophets, and all the people, small and great, made a covenant before the Lord, to keep his commandments, and his testimonies, and his statutes, with all their heart and with all their soul. But what statutes ? What testimonies ? “The words of the covenant written in this book.” Christ speaketh many things, his apostles many things, concerning the doctrine of the prophets, but no one point of doctrine which is not found in their books and writings. The prophet Isaiah crieth, “Ad legem et testimonium,—To the law and to the testimony.” If they teach not according to this law, it is because there is no light in them. Consider the practice of Christ Jesus. His proofs are, “Scriptum est,—It is written.” His demands are, “Quomodo legis?—How dost thou read ?” His apologies are, “Scrutanini Scripturas,—Search the Scriptures ; they bear me record.” His apostles tread in the same path ; they go not the breadth of an hair, not a whit from that which is written. Thus St. Paul protesteth—“I delivered unto you that which I received, how Christ died for our sins, according to the Scriptures, and that he was buried, and that he rose

the third day, according to the Scriptures.” It is not lightly to be marked, which is twice repeated. He delivered nothing but “according to the Scriptures.” “I would hear the voice of my pastor (saith St. Augustin) read this out of some prophet, read it out of some psalm, recite it out of the law, recite it out of the gospel, recite it out of some apostle; read it, and we will believe it.” These be good precedents for us to follow, till sufficient reason be alleged why we should lay another foundation than that which hath been laid by so many, so wise, so reverend builders.

Especially sith this foundation is so peculiar to the truth that we cannot rest upon any other, without manifest danger of the utter overthrow of Christian faith. For, first, what certainty or assurance can we have of any of those things which are believed, if our faith do not lean only upon the Scriptures? If once a religious credit be given to unwritten verities, and to men’s reports, the undoubted articles of our belief cannot chioose but at the length become doubtful and uncertain, like a tale that passeth from man to man, and is told as many ways as there are men to tell it. Again, if once it be granted that there is any part of the law of God unwritten, if entrance once be given to laws that pass by the word of mouth, I would know when we should be able to say, “Now we have all the statutes of God, these we must observe, but more we may not receive.” The Marcionites, they have a doctrine, as they say, received from the apostles by tradition, without book: Valentinus, he likewise urgeth very stoutly, “Christ had many things to tell his disciples, which as then they could not bear, and therefore his doctrine may not be tried by *the book*—it is a tradition.”* Let anything but the written word of God take place in matters of faith, and who seeth not that the very main sea of heresies must needs break in upon the Church of Christ? These are, as we suppose, causes just and allowable, and sufficient in the indifferent judgment of reasonable men, why we should deliver you no doctrine concerning faith and religion, but only that which is in Scripture; why we should admonish you to beware of bread soured with pharisaical leaven, and to feed upon that which ye know came down from heaven; to shun broken cisterns, and to come to the Well of living waters, as ye are exhorted by the prophet.

At this the adverse part doth greatly storm; they cannot abide to have controversies judged only by the Scriptures. They which make Scripture only the ground and foundation of

* Marcion and Valentinus were heretics of the second century.

faith, are no fit builders for the Church of Rome. When Constantinus required that those matters, about which the Church was then very hot in contention, might be decided, only according to those things which are written, the answer of Hilary was, “*Hoc qui repudiat Antichristus est ;**—He which refuseth this is Antichrist.” Why, then, do our adversaries fly this kind of trial? Why refuse they to go to the law and testimonies, there to be judged? The reason is rendered by the prophet, “It is because there is no light in them.” They have chosen to themselves another foundation than that of the prophets and apostles. Wherefore, as Herod, to cover the baseness of his stock, and to the end that in time he might be thought to be of the blood royal, burned the sacred monuments and books of the Jews, wherein the lineal descents, pedigrees, and genealogies of the kings of Israel were described :† so they, to strengthen the authority of their base and ill-favoured grounds, do endeavour, not only in word and writing, by contumelious and reproachful terms, to discountenance, but also (if the power of God were not greater than theirs) by fire and flame to destroy for ever the eternal testament of the Son of God. We charge them with no corner attempts; we have seen the burning of these heavenly records, we have seen the very handling of the book of life punished with bitter and cruel death. May we not justly say to that man of sin, as St. Augustine to Petilian? “*Judas Christum carnalem tradidit, tu spiritualem: furens evangelium sanctum flammis sacrilegis tradidisti ‡*—Judas betrayed Christ in the flesh, but thou in the spirit. In thy fury thou hast delivered the holy Gospel unto heinous flames.”

But what are the grounds for which they have thus furiously bent themselves against the writings of the Holy Ghost? The grounds, whereupon they build such doctrines as cannot stand with the Scriptures of God, are feigned miracles, the record and witness of foul spirits, precepts of men, muddy legends, uncertain traditions: which grounds, so long as the light of the Gospel shineth in men's eyes, so long as we have the Scriptures to direct us in our judgment, are easily perceived to be but bogs

* Hilar. Pictavor. Episc. Lucub. quotquot extant. Basil. 1550. pp 292, 3.

† Ambros. Op. Par. 1686. Expos. Ev. sec. Luc. Lib. iii. 11. Tom i. col. 1329.

‡ *Judas Christum carnaliter tradidit, tu spiritualiter furens evangelium sanctum flammis sacrilegis tradidisti.* August. Op. Par. 1694. Contra literas Petilian Lib. ii. 17. Tom. ix. col. 221. This charge is made by Petilian against Augustine, not by Augustine against Petilian.

and false grounds; but take away the Scriptures, put out the light, and, in darkness, who can descry what they are? This is the only reason why Antichrist doth so much strive to hoodwink the world, by conveying the Scriptures out of sight.

By the Scriptures we learn that the coming of that wicked one shall be "with power, and signs, and lying wonders, and in all deceivableness of unrighteousness;" which when we hear, it giveth us plainly to understand, that miracles are rather to be taken for causes of reasonable suspicion, than infallible proofs of true doctrine. But the Pope well perceiveth, that, if the Scriptures may be buried, his miracles will then stand him in good stead. As soon as Philip preached the things that concerned the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, to the people of Samaria, they forsook the sorceries of Simon Magus, and believed the doctrine of the Scriptures; but till then they all gave heed to witchcraft, and their general judgment of Magus was, "This man is the power of the great God."

In the Scriptures we are charged to hear Moses and the prophets. In the Scriptures we find that Christ refused the testimony of an unclean spirit. In the Scriptures we have learned how to answer them which send us either to devils, or dead men's ghosts, to be schooled and taught. "Should not a people enquire at their God? From the living to the dead?" But let it be provided, that such sentences as these may be no more remembered, and then what is it which the Pope may not confirm by his pale and grisly witnesses? When men do not hear of these Scriptures, they will easily find as good reason as Saul to open their ears, and to listen unto Satan. "God answereth me no more neither by prophets, nor by dreams: therefore I have called thee, that thou mayest tell me what to do."

How often are we warned in Scripture to take heed that we build not religion upon doctrines of men? How sharply are the Corinthians taken up by the apostle, for pinning themselves upon men's sleeves, saying, "I am of Paul, and I of Apollos?" But if this were concealed, who would controul the Pope for dividing his train; for appointing some to be of Benedict, some of Francis, some of Dominick; for exacting more rigorously the strict observation of their rules, than the keeping of the laws and statutes of God?

So long as the mist of Popery was thick enough to stop the light of the Scriptures of God, the fabulous legends of saints' lives were thought as true as the Gospel. There they had, with marvellous cunning conveyance, interlaced all points of Popish doctrine; which, being barely taught, would, by reason of the grossness of them, have been loathed in short time; but

being mingled with strange and pleasant fables, and so poured both into young and tender wits, as the first liquor wherewith their minds were seasoned, and into old heads, as the only thing that might hold them, even then when all other entries of delight were shut up, so long as they had but an ear left, were so effectual to deceive all sorts of men, that, knowing this, we cannot marvel if Popery were spread far and wide. He did the Pope very profitable service which first found out this ground to build on. It bare up their building a great while; but after that, the light began a little to appear. When men had gotten once a sight of the Scriptures in a known tongue, they wondered to see the world so deluded, insomuch that, even amongst themselves, such as had any small freedom of judgment, spared not plainly to avouch, that this ground was but mire and slough, altogether unfit for spiritual building. "Why that book should be called a golden legend," saith Vives (for so it was intituled), "I do not know, sith it was written by a man of an iron mouth, and a leaden heart, and is altogether full of most shameless lies."* Erasmus likewise, "At this day (saith he) every body's dreams, yea the dotages of silly women, are read amongst divine Scriptures."

The last ground which they have, and the fairest to the eye, is their traditions. Under the name of doctrine received from Moses by word of mouth, without writing, that is to say tradition, the Scribes and Pharisees were able smoothly to carry away anything, till Christ recalled all things to the law, the Psalms, and prophets, till he opened the Scriptures. And as in other grounds so in this, the Pope hath found by good experience, that they cannot stand longer than the Scriptures lie secret and unknown.

He, therefore, that buildeth upon these grounds, hath cause, I think, to bestir hand and foot, that men may be always kept off from the Scriptures. For whatsoever is builded upon these grounds, by the Scripture it is overthrown. The Scriptures have prescribed an holy communion: they upon their foundation have reared a blasphemous mass. The Scripture maketh baptism the consecrated seal of man's salvation: they upon their foundation have builded the baptism of bells and ships. The Scripture saith, Christ was offered up but once: they upon

* *Quam indigna est divis a hominibus Christianis illa sanctorum historia, quæ legenda aurea nominatur, quam nescio cur auream appellent, quum scripta sit ab homine ferrei oris, plumbei cordis. Quid fœdus dici potest illo libro? ô quam pudendum est nobis Christianis, non esse præstantissimos nostrorum divorum actus verius et accuratius memoriæ mandatos.*—Lodovici Vivis Op. Basil. 1555. De causis corruptarum artium Lib. ii. Tom. i. pp. 371, 2.

their foundation have erected an altar, whereupon he is daily offered up. The Scripture will have the Scriptures to be read of all men, prayer to be made with understanding, Christ to be a full satisfaction for sin, worship to be done unto God alone : they upon their foundations have builded a doctrine that forbiddeth God's people to read his word, that teacheth them to pour out their prayer in a tongue which they cannot understand, that hath found out a way to satisfy the wrath of Almighty God in this life by penance, and after this life by indurance in purgatory ; a doctrine that commandeth them to call upon saints and souls departed, to worship the work of their own hands, to say to a piece of bread, " My Lord and my God." If these doctrines of theirs did not contain, as they do, most manifest impiety, yet all religion builded upon such grounds must needs be vain and frivolous. For although we offer up never so many sacrifices ; though we keep all the days in the year holy ; though we pray, and give thanks, and do alms ; yet except we know that herein we show obedience to the laws and statutes of our God, we do but tire out ourselves in vain. Will God reward those things wherein he taketh no delight ? or taketh he delight in anything, and hath not showed it ? Or hath he showed it, and not in Scripture ? Doubtless they worship him but in vain, which either teach or practise the precepts of men for the laws of God. That they teach or practise the precepts of men, they will not grant ; yet the most that possibly they can allege to prove any one of these things to be of God is this—Such or such a Father saith, that this or this, being not written, is nevertheless apostolical. And they know that the witnesses whom they cite in matters of tradition do sometimes check and contrary one another. In the controversy that was between the East and West Churches concerning the feast of Easter, the one part alleged tradition to prove their custom ; and the other part, tradition to prove the contrary. It might be that neither was apostolical ; both could not be, when each gainsayed the other. Yet both must be, if all be apostolical, which the Fathers have said is apostolical. If all be not, where is the certainty of these grounds ? Why do they murder, burn, and persecute, from place to place, as many as make any doubt of these things, which are grounded upon so fickle and weak foundation ?

But to leave the foundation whereupon they build their doctrine, if in the rest we find them as corrupt, as in this they have been declared weak ! Surely, then, we may boldly affirm, that the Church of Rome is rather a sink of all abomination, than a fountain from whence those living waters, or a store-house wherein that heavenly food, whereof the prophet Isaiah speaketh, may be

had. Let us, therefore, now consider the end, as well of our religion as of theirs. Let us view the mark whereat each part doth shoot. Whatsoever men do, they do it to some end; and the quality of things which are done to any end, is judged to be good or bad by the end whereunto they are done. Hereof it is, that in Scripture, things otherwise highly commended, as prayer, fasting, and alms deeds, are most bitterly reprov'd when they tend to bad ends. As there is but one Author, from whom all things are, so there is but one end, unto whom all things should incline and bend themselves. God is Alpha, the first, from whom all other things have their being and beginning; wherefore in reason he is Omega, the end, and final cause of all things: upon him they must attend, and seeing they are not of themselves, therefore they may not serve themselves, but for the glory of Him by whom they are. From hence a rule may be gathered, to judge between pure religion in deed, and that which is untruly so called. For that religion no doubt is best which most advanceth the glory of God; and that which taketh most from him, the worst. “*Ipsi gloria in Ecclesia*—In the Church of God all glory is given, not to men, but to him.” This is the song of the true Church of Christ, “*Righteousness, O Lord, belongeth unto thee, but unto us open shame.*” Wherefore, touching ourselves, we teach, with the blessed apostles and prophets, that by nature we are the children of wrath; that corruption is bred and settled within our bones; that we are both born and begotten in it; that with it all the powers and faculties of our nature are infected; that still it cleaveth fast unto our souls, and although the deadly sting be taken from it, yet there it sticketh as long as life doth endure, so irksome and so grievous, that it forceth the most upright and perfect to cry, “*Miserable man, who shall deliver me?*”

By this inbred corruption our understanding is so darkened, that naturally we cannot perceive the things which are of God; no, we count them foolishness; our will is in such thralldom and slavery unto sin, that it cannot like of anything spiritual and heavenly, but is wholly carried unto fleshly desires.

If, therefore, we perceive the things that are of God, and do like of them; if our hearts be inclined to do his will, because this cannot come of ourselves (our nature bending a clean contrary way), we acknowledge, most willingly and unfeignedly, the good we do is his, it is not ours; our beginning to do, and our continuance in doing well, proceedeth only and wholly from him. If any man receive the grace of God offered, it is because God hath framed his heart thereto. If any man come when God calleth, it is because his grace, which calleth, draweth. If, being

brought unto Christ, we continue in him, we have no other reason to yield of our doing, but only this—he hath linked us and fastened us unto himself. We neither rise when we are fallen, nor stand when we are risen, by *our* strength. When we are in distress, we are of ourselves so far from ability to help ourselves, that we are not able to crave help of him, unless his Spirit wrest out “Abba Father” from us. We cannot moan our own case, unless he do groan and sigh for us; we are not able to name Jesus, unless by the special grace of his Spirit our mouths be opened; no, we cannot of ourselves so much as think of naming him, if to think of naming him be a good thought.

When, against our natural inclination to evil, his Spirit, which worketh all in all, hath so prevailed, that we now begin to hate the works of the flesh, having an earnest desire to abound in love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance, and all other fruits of the Spirit; yet, by reason of the strength of that body of sin which ever fighteth against the spirit, our inward man is so weakened, that we cannot do the things which we would; and the things which we do, even the best of them, are so far beneath that perfection which the law of God requireth, that, if he should rigorously examine them in justice, no flesh could ever be accounted righteous in his sight. The loathsome things that can be imagined, the clothes that be most unclean, are not so foul as our very righteousness is unrighteous. Whereupon we conclude, that whatsoever we receive by way of reward at God’s hand, either in this life, or in the life to come, we receive it as a thing freely given by him, without any merit or desert of ours. We do not say in our hearts, “The Lord hath given us these good things to possess for our righteousness:” for seeing it is he which giveth both to will and to do, he crowneth indeed his own work, when he rewardeth ours; and he never rewardeth any work of his own, wherein there is not somewhat of ours which he pardoneth.

Thus being naked and utterly destitute in ourselves, we seek all things in Christ Jesus. Him only we acknowledge to be our wisdom, our justification, our sanctification, our redemption, our priest, our sacrifice, our king, our head, our mediator, our physician, our way, our truth, our life. In ourselves we find nothing but poverty and weakness; praise, and honour, and glory, we give to him. The only mark we aim at is, to set up his throne, to advance his kingdom, to make it known that in him the Father hath laid up all the treasures of heaven; to the end, that unto him the thirsty may repair for water, the hungry for bread, the naked for clothes, and be all for all things needful to the safety of our souls and bodies.

This is not the scope which the Church of Rome proposeth ; they direct all things to another end. “How can ye believe (saith Christ to the Jews), which receive honour one of another, and seek not that honour which cometh of God alone ?” And how can the faith of the Church of Rome be sound, sith they hold such doctrines as tend wholly to their own glory, their own gain, and not to the praise and honour of God ?

That they seek not his glory, but their own, it may appear unto any man which thoroughly considereth of their doctrine. First, they will not acknowledge that poverty and nakedness, those filthy garments of corruption and sin, wherein Adam had wrapped his posterity ; but in the pride of their hearts they dissemble it, diminish it, and make light of it. For although they deny not but that man’s nature is corrupted, yet mark how they pare and lessen this corruption. The prophet David doth term it wickedness and sin ; but they make it only an inclination unto sinning. The Lord himself doth witness, that by it “all the imaginations of the thoughts of man’s heart are only evil :” they restrain it to the inferior part of the soul, and make it only a mother of some grosser desires. The blessed apostle prayed, groaned, and wept against it, as a thing which made him altogether weary of his life : but after baptism, they make no more account of those inward rebellious motions against the spirit, than they do of the beating of a man’s pulse.

REPENTANCE.

BY THE RIGHT REV. R. KIDDER, D.D.,

LORD BISHOP OF BATH AND WELLS.

WHEN we are gone thus far, and have found out our sins, we must then put them away by a true and hearty repentance. Unless we do this we shall eat and drink damnation to ourselves. Now because, though repentance be very commonly pretended to, yet we do often mistake ourselves in it, and take that for it which comes far short of it; therefore it is very necessary we should examine our repentance, and very carefully try whether it be such as is never to be repented of. For as it is very common with men to think they have not sinned when they have, so it is also as usual a thing with them to conceit that they have repented when indeed they have not. For we are too apt to think repentance no more but a calling to God for mercy, or a general confession that we are sinners, or some sudden purposes of amendment of life, or at most the actual abstaining from our sin. Therefore it will be worth our while that we examine our repentance, and that we may do by the following rules.

He that repents is greatly sorrowful for his sin. He is inwardly grieved that he should offend God by his sins; and would rather choose any loss or trouble than commit his sin again. His sorrow is very hearty and unfeigned; he is grieved in earnest, and his grief is great according to the measure and proportion of his sin and folly. He is vile and base in his own eyes, and is greatly afflicted for his wickedness. Indeed, the sincerity of his sorrow is not altogether to be measured by his tears which he sheds: for though tears be reputed the measure of our grief, yet are they but the expression of it: grief does many times break out this way; but yet a man may be greatly sorrowful when the greatness of his grief cannot be gathered from the multitude of his tears. Some there are who do easily weep; a very trifling matter will draw forth plenty of tears. But there are others who grieve more and yet weep less. But then it is still

an ill sign, if, when we have tears for every little trouble, we have none for our sins. We read of one Alexander Pheræus that he was ready to weep at the acting of a tragedy, and that he left the stage that the spectators might not behold his tears: but then we also read of the same man that he shed the blood of many Thessalian nobles with dry cheeks. Such false tears had that tyrant at his command. Certainly we may well suspect ourselves when we can find plenty of tears upon every little accident which doth disturb us, and yet can find none at all for our heinous offences against God. For it may be reasonably thought, that if our grief were hearty and pungent which we have for our sins, it would break out at the same vent which it is wont to find upon all other occasions. Certain it is, however, that the true penitent is a very sorrowful man; and though his temper may not give way to plenty of tears, yet his real grief is not the less. Though he do not weep so plentifully, yet he grieves as heartily as he that doth. He does afflict himself for his sin, he judges and condemns himself, and feels as much pain in his soul, and as cordial a sorrow, as he that weeps bitterly.

He that truly repents, does confess his sins unto God. And this he must do in order to his pardon: "If we confess our sins he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins," &c. (1 John i. 9). But then this confession alone does not bring us nearer our pardon; we must confess them with shame and sorrow; we must judge and condemn ourselves; and after the most humble manner debase ourselves, and beg pardon from God. Our confession must be very humble and very full. We must be particular in it, and not content ourselves that we confess ourselves to be sinners in general; but we must confess our particular sins unto God. We must confess all the sins we can find—all that we can remember. And then for those which we cannot find, or do not remember, it will be needful that we should pray also for the pardon of them, as the psalmist does: "Cleanse thou me from secret faults," (Ps. xix. 12). And as we must confess our sins, so we must also confess the degrees and the aggravations of them; for these do greatly enhance our guilt, and swell our sins into a very great measure. But all this while we must be very greatly careful that our confession be the result of our real sorrow and trouble of heart. God will not be put off with a parcel of good words. If we do not abhor our sins, it will not avail us that we do confess them. God knows our sins already, nor is he pleased to hear us repeat them to him unless we hate them, and be really pressed with the burden of them. It is the burdened sinner whom God hath a respect unto: he that is full of his sorrow for his sin, it is he that confesses his sin as he

ought; such a man finds the advantage of an humble confession of his sin unto God: for this gives a great ease to his soul, which would have been overcharged if he should have kept silence. This the psalmist tells us: "When I kept silence (says he) my bones waxed old,.....and my moisture is turned into the drought of summer." But then he adds, "I acknowledged my sin unto thee, and mine iniquity have I not hid. I said, I will confess my transgressions unto the Lord, and thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin." (Ps. xxxii. 3-7.) And then we find him greatly at ease and quiet.

He that truly repents, does forsake his sins and lead a new life: he does not only purpose, but he really does that good which he did intend to do. He does not lead such a life as he did before. He abstains from the sin which he formerly loved and followed. Nor does he only abstain from it, but he does abhor it, and so he does every sin whatever; and gives up himself to an universal obedience to all the laws of God. We have no reason to think we have repented till we lead a new and an holy life. It is this which completes our repentance, and nothing short of this can give us any assurance that we have repented, and that we are in a state of grace. It is a vain thing to think that we are the better for purposes of amendment when we do not amend. If we purpose never so much to do well, and yet continue in our evil doing, we shall be reputed amongst the workers of iniquity. Repentance imports a change both of heart and life. It requires a new life and conversation, and where there is this grace there is this change to be found. The holy Scriptures annex our pardon to our repentance; but then they require such a repentance as does import no less than a new life and conversation. Thus we find in the prophet how the repentance of a sinner is expressed: "If he turn from his sin, and do that which is lawful and right; if the wicked restore the pledge, give again that he had robbed, walk in the statutes of life without committing iniquity; he shall surely live, he shall not die," (Ezek. xxxiii. 14, 15). Again, "If the wicked will turn from all his sins that he hath committed, and keep all my statutes, and do that which is lawful and right, he shall surely live and not die," (xviii. 21). And when the sinner is called upon to repent, we find it thus expressed: "Seek the Lord while he may be found, call ye upon him while he is near; let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts, and let him return unto the Lord," (Isa. lv. 6, 7). By which it is evident that repentance implies a change of life, and so indeed it does. That man who resolves to do well and does not do it, does at once mock God and cheat his own soul.

He that truly repents, his repentance does arise from his love to God, and an hatred to his sins, because they are an offence to God. This is the root from whence repentance does spring.

The love of God constrains the sinner to repentance; and his love to God it is that makes his repentance of the right kind and stamp. It is very possible that a man may be greatly sorrowful upon the account of his sins, and that he may make a particular confession of them to God, and when he hath done that he may forsake his sins too, and yet not have the grace of true repentance all this while: and that because this change does not arise from a love to God and an hatred of his sin, as it is an offence against God. A man may be very sorrowful for his sins because they have brought a great misery upon him, and do besides expose him to the justice of God. Such a man is sorrowful for the ill consequence of his sin rather than for its obliquity and immorality. And perhaps he forsakes his sin too, and yet is no true penitent: for he may leave his sin for many reasons, and yet not repent of it. A bare abstaining from sin is no sufficient argument that he hath repented of it. A man may forbear his sin and abstain from it, because he cannot follow it, or hath not the liberty to enjoy it any longer, and yet his mind remains unchanged still; or else perhaps he exchanges one sin for another, and chooses a sin which he judges most expedient. But the true penitent abstains from his sin because he loves his God. Nay, he does not only abstain from his sin, but he hates it also.

The reason why he leaves his sin, is because he is himself changed in his mind and affections: he now hates what he loved before, and flies from that which before he did pursue. He sees his folly as well as his misery, and leaves his sin, not only because God is just, and will severely punish the wicked, but because he is good and holy, and cannot endure to behold iniquity. He abstains from his sin not only because it is forbidden fruit, but because it is contrary to his nature. He that is not in the state of grace may abstain from his sin as a sick man does from salt meats (which yet he greatly loves), because his physician and his interest severely forbid him: but the true penitent forbears his sin, because he finds in his soul an antipathy against it, and not only because it is forbidden.

Such a repentance as this must we find in our souls before we can be fit to partake of Christ's holy mysteries. And well it will become us to be greatly humbled for our sins, and to abhor them when we do commemorate the death of our Lord and Saviour. For he died for sin, and endured the shame and sor-

row of the cross that he might take away our sins, and that they might no longer abide in us. And if we come with our sins to this holy table, we do crucify our Lord afresh; we do trample upon his precious blood, and count it a common and unholy thing.

To what hath been said this must be added, that when by our sin we have not only offended God, but also injured and wronged our neighbour, we are strictly and indispensably obliged to make him restitution, as well as to beg the forgiveness of God. We can expect no pardon from God if we do not make amends to our neighbour whom we have wronged. "If the wicked restore the pledge, and give again that he had robbed, &c. he shall surely live and not die," (Ezek. xxxiii. 15). But then if he do not this (or sincerely resolve to do it as soon as he is able to do it), he shall surely die, and not live. And his partaking of the holy table shall be so far from saving him from the anger of God, that it will increase his guilt and add to his sin. Let no man think that God will hear him, if he do not make his brother amends for the wrong he hath done him. We have a story in our books of one Halyattes, that his soldiers did set on fire the corn of the Milesians, and that the fire, by the violence of the wind, caught hold of the temple of Minerva, and burnt it down. It happened sometime after this that Halyattes falls sick, and sends to the oracle to know what would be the success of his disease; but the messengers were told by the oracle, that they must not expect any answer till the temple which they had burnt were first repaired. Most certain it is that we shall have no return of our prayers from heaven, when we confess and beg the pardon of our sin, unless we do first make restitution where we have wronged our brother. It cannot be thought we have repented if we do not restore. There is no sacrifice will expiate our crime, if we do not also make restitution. Under the law of Moses, he that had wronged his brother was obliged, indeed, to bring a sacrifice for his atonement; but then at the same time he was obliged to make a full restitution to his neighbour whom he had wronged; and to add also a fifth part to the principal before he could be forgiven, (Levit. vi.) "He that wronged his neighbour was by that law sometime liable to restore double," (Exod. xxii. 4-9). Sometime four and five fold (v. 1.), where the trespasser was convicted: but then where the offender became penitent, and confessed his sin, yet in this case he was obliged to make restitution, to add a fifth part, and to bring his offering (Num. v. 7). His repentance nor his offering would not serve his turn, unless he also made amends to his neighbour whom he had wronged. Nay,

the day of expiation (as the Jews teach us) would not avail to take away the guilt which we contracted by doing wrong to our brother.

And we must remember that we are obliged to make restitution not only where we have done an open and forcible injury, as the robber and thief and violent oppressor are bound to restore what they have wronged their brother of by their violent injustice ; but we are also obliged to restore what we have by any means unjustly got the possession of. And there are more ways than one by which we may become guilty of injustice. He that overreaches and outwits his brother in a bargain, he that in his trading deals fraudulently and insincerely, he that hides and conceals from his neighbour his just rights and dues ; such men as these are obliged to make restitution as well as the open robber and the thief. There are, indeed, very many things which the laws of the land do not take notice of, which yet we are obliged to in the court of conscience. And we are, before we do receive this sacrament, very severely to examine our own consciences ; whether in our dealings with men we have done as we would be done by, and have not detained and withheld our neighbours due from him. Indeed, we are come to that pass, that we are not afraid of doing an unjust action if we can but do it cautiously and sily. Nay, we are ready to rejoice when we have cunningly circumvented our brother ; and men look upon it as but a little fault, if any at all, when they do craftily circumvent even him that attends upon holy things. But certain it is, whoever does wrong his brother and him that ministers at God's altar, he deceives himself most, and must never look for pardon from God till he have repented of his sin, and made restitution for the wrong he hath done.

And what hath been said hitherto of the necessity of making restitution, must not only be understood of the wrong we have done to our neighbour as to his goods and estate, but of other wrongs whatsoever ; and particularly of that wrong we have done to his name and credit. We ought to judge the best of all men, and to make the most charitable construction of all the actions of our neighbour ; and, therefore, if we have done otherwise, we are obliged to repentance and to restitution for the wrong which we have done. If we have openly slandered our brother, or more closely and sily undermined his credit and good name, we are obliged in this case to make, as far as we are able, a reparation—that is, we are obliged to unsay what we have said, and by our words do him honour, as we have endeavoured before to do him a discredit. In a word, we are bound to make him such an amends as we are able, or such as may satisfy him

to whom we have done the wrong. And when we have done this, we must humble ourselves greatly in the sight of God for this sin, and be very careful that we sin no more.

Thus must we cleanse and purge our souls before we dare to come to the holy table. We must purge out our old leaven that we may be a new lump: otherwise we shall meet with death there where we might else have found life. And we ought, therefore, to be very careful and solicitous, lest we should, by our remissness and hypocrisy, expose ourselves to the greatest curse. As we love our souls, then, we must not only find out our sin, but we must put it away also; and before we presume to eat of this bread and drink of this cup, we must find in our souls such a repentance as is never to be repented of.

NOTES.

THE doctrine of the scholastic divines of the Church of Rome was very curious as to the nature of original sin. Archbishop Laurence observes (Bampton Lect., serm. iii. p. 58)—“They contended that the infection of our nature is not a mental, but a mere corporeal taint; that the body alone receives and transmits the contagion, while the soul, in all instances, proceeds immaculate from the hands of her Creator. This disposition to disease, such as they allowed it to be, was considered by some of them as the effect of a peculiar quality in the forbidden fruit; by some, as having been contracted from the poisonous breath of the infernal spirit which inhabited the serpent’s body. On one point they were all united; by preserving to the soul the bright traces of her origin unimpaired, they founded on a deceitful basis an arrogant creed, which, in declaring peace and pardon to the sinner, rested more upon personal merit than the satisfaction of a Saviour.” (See Scotus, lib. ii. dist. 32).

It was a prevalent tenet among the scholastic divines at the period of the Reformation, that Christ died only for original sin; but that for our actual sins we must ourselves make satisfaction. This doctrine was, of course, strongly combated by the Reformers. (See Laurence, Bampton Lect., p. 261, notes to sermon iii. See Luther, Op. Witten, vol. vii. 239). “*Præterea plerique ipsorum jam rursus horribili et Satanica audaciâ et impudentiâ incipiunt docere Christum tantum satisfacere pro peccato originali et præteritis peccatis pro actualibus et sequentibus oportere nos satisfacere. Hoc nihil dissimulanter et palam est facere ex Christianis Turcas et Ethnicos.*”

Thus original sin, according to the scholastic divines, consisted, not in the presence of anything offensive to God, but solely in the absence of that which is agreeable to him. But this doctrine was held by them to signify no mental and moral defect, but simply a physical and corporeal one. (See Laurence, serm. iii. p. 62). But as he observes, in his notes on the same sermon (p. 265), the peculiarity of the doctrine cannot be better explained than in the words of Luther: “*Dissentiunt (i. e., scholastici) a Pelagianis quod sine Christo non posse bene vivi meritorie concedunt, et ita Christus non est mortuus propter peccatum, sed propter non meritum; non fuisset necesse eum mori, ut inferni pœnas solveret sed tantum ut mereri cœlum contingeret. Nam finge parvulum adolescere sine peccato, id enim etsi difficile, tamen asserunt possibile, huic non est necessarius Christus redemptor de potestate Diaboli, sed adiutor duntaxat ad cœlum, quia si is moreretur nec ad infernum nec cœlum veniret.*” (Witten Op., vol i. p. 13).

Righteousness, said the scholastic divines, had been given to Adam;

but as he had lost that righteousness, so the want of it inheres in all his descendants. "Peccatum originale (says Nicolaus de Orbellis, lib. ii. dist. 30, 31) est carentia justitiæ originalis, cum debito habendi eam, cum ergo quæritur per quam viam peccatum intrat, dico, quod debitum oritur ex datione justitiæ Adæ pro se et posteris." Now the punishment due to this original sin was not damnation, but merely a deprivation of the beatific vision. (See Scotus, lib. ii. sent. dist. 33).

The Pelagian heresy was not widely different from this: Pelagius denied that there was any original sin, the scholastics denied that it extended to the soul.

Luther, in his "Commentary on Hosea," thus speaks concerning original sin: "Natura enim ad vitam condita, morti et infinitas calamitatibus subjecta est. Mens in quâ Dei notitia lucebat, per peccatum ita excæcata est ut Deum amplius non agnoscat. Voluntas quoque ad eum modum est depravata ut diversum concupiscat a lege Dei. Itaque mirabilis ἀταξία omnium affectuum seu motuum est qui etsi omnes *per se vitiosi non sunt* nam appetitus cibi et potus, amor conjugis, liberorum et parontum et similes affectus etiam in integra natura exitissent, tamen nunc non *ita* pura sunt, semper enim adhæret vitiosum *aliquid* legi Dei adversum." (Op., vol iv. p. 277).

The doctrine of the Reformers was, and the doctrine of our Church is, that the *guilt* of original sin is removed in baptism; but that the innate corruption, which was the consequence of the fall, remained. Thus Melancthon: "Ideo sic respondemus in baptismo tolli peccatum quod ad reatum seu imputationem attinet, sed *manere morbum ipsum* qui est malum pugnans cum lege Dei, *dignum morte eternâ nisi renitteretur.*" (Loc. Theol., p. 122).

This opinion was condemned by Leo X., who maintained, with the scholastic divines, that the corruption of human nature, as well as the imputed guilt, was removed at baptism. (See Laurence, B. L., p. 274.)

Article IX. of the Church of England.—"Of Original or Birth Sin.—Original sin standeth not in the following of Adam, as the Pelagians do vainly talk, but is the fault and corruption of the nature of every man that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam; whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, and is of his own nature inclined to evil, so that the flesh lusteth always contrary to the spirit; and, therefore, in every person born into this world, it deserveth God's wrath and damnation. And this infection of nature doth remain, yea, in them that are regenerated; whereby the lust of the flesh, called in the Greek *φρόνημα σαρκος*, which some do expound the wisdom, some sensuality, some the affection, some the desire, of the flesh, is not subject to the law of God. And although there is no condemnation for them that believe and are baptized, yet the apostle doth confess, that concupiscence and lust hath of itself the nature of sin."

The Calvinistic divines declared original sin to be a *total* depravation of man's nature; and feeling that neither Luther, nor Melancthon, nor the English Reformers agreed with them, they (*i. e.*, the Assembly of

Divines, A. D. 1643) proposed the following alterations in the nineteenth Article :—

ORIGINAL.	CALVINISTIC EMENDATION.
—but it is the fault, &c.	—but (together with his first sin imputed) it is the fault, &c.
—man is very far gone from original righteousness, &c.	—man is wholly deprived of his original righteousness.
—inclined to evil.	—inclined only to evil.
—concupiscence and lust hath of itself the nature of sin.	—concupiscence and lust is truly and properly sin.

The Assembly of Divines revised the first fifteen Articles with the design, as Neal himself remarks, “to render their sense more express and determinate in favour of Calvinism.”

The doctrine of the Lutherans, as to the question of *total* depravity, may be given in the words of Melancthon : “*Est ergo vera definitio legis naturæ, legem naturæ esse notitiam legis divinæ naturæ hominis insitam. Ideo enim dicitur homo ad imaginem Dei conditus esse, quia in eo lucebat imago, hoc est notitia Dei et similitudo quædam mentis divinæ, id est discrimen honestorem et turpium et cum his notitiis congruebant vires hominis..... Quamquam autem in hac naturæ corruptione, deformatâ imagine Dei, non ita fulgent notitiæ, manent tamen, sed cor repugnat et incurrent dubitationes propter quædam quæ pugnare videntur cum illis notitiis.*” (*Loci Theologici*, p. 173).

They never, therefore, entertained the idea at all.

The question, whether concupiscence was sin or not, was differently answered. The Papists said, No. “*Peccatum originale non potest esse aliud quam ista privatio (justitiæ) non enim est concupiscentia, tum quia illa est naturalis, tum quia ipsa est in parte sensitiva, ubi non est peccatum.*” (See also decrees of Council of Trent).

The Lutherans said, Yes. “*Hanc malam concupiscentiam dicimus esse peccatum.*” (Saxon Confession, written in 1551).

The Calvinists said, Yes. (See their alteration of the nineteenth Article of our Church).

The Church of England takes a middle course, declaring that lust and concupiscence hath in itself the nature of sin; and her phraseology is more guarded than that of the Augsburg Confession, in simply stating, that “original sin deserves God’s wrath and damnation,” instead of “damning and bringing to eternal death those who are not regenerated by baptism and the Holy Spirit.”

The doctrine of imputation—that is, that men are damned through the imputed guilt of Adam—has been attributed to Calvin by Turretin and others; they deemed the doctrine essential to the unity and correctness of the system, and were unwilling to suppose Calvin opposed to it. It does not, however, appear that he believed it, if we take his own testimony : “*Hæc itaque duo distincte observanda, nempe sic omnibus naturæ nostræ partibus vitiati perversique, jam ob talem duntaxat corruptionem damnati merito convictique coram Deo tenemuratque ideo infantes quoque ipsi dum suam secum damnationem*

afferunt non alieno sed ipsorum vitio sunt obstrieti." (Inst., lib. ii. cap. i., sec. 8).

Thus, then, the views of original sin held by different bodies are as follows. Those of—

1. The Pelagians, Socinians, and Arians; who deny it altogether.
2. Papists; who declare it to be a mere coporeal taint, and not deserving of punishment.
3. Lutherans; who declare it to be spiritual as well as corporeal, and deserving of hell, but partial in its extent.
4. Calvinists; who declare it to be a total depravity of soul and body, and the cause of actual damnation.
5. Church of England; see Article XIX.

The differences between the doctrines of our Church and those of the Lutherans are very slight; our Church is more moderate, and more guarded in her phraseology. (See the preceeding notes).

¶ The Calvinists are necessitated to hold the tenets they do, as to original sin; for if it were not a total depravity of the whole man, we must acknowledge some efficacy, though not merit, in good works. The doctrine of total depravity serves to reconcile, after some lame and incomplete manner, the justice of God with the damnation from all eternity of the non-elect; the sin of Adam being imputed to the infant reprobate, born perverted and depraved, just as the righteousness of Christ is to the equally perverted and depraved elect infant. Well might Luther call such a doctrine as this impious. "Omnes facile judicare possunt quanta perversitas et dissolutio ex cogitationibus hincce impiis emergat." (Postilla Domestica. Mart. Luth.)

That the inward and spiritual grace spoken of in baptism is the remission of original sin, may be shown by the Nicene Creed.

"I acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins." Now suppose the person to be an adult when baptised, and as is, alas! frequently the case, impenitent, what sins are remitted? Not the actual sins which are unrepented of, but the original sin; for if not, then does our Church utter a falsehood, and she declares a remission of sin where there is no such thing. St. Peter says (1 Eph. iii. 21), "The like figure whereunto even baptism doth now *save* us, not by putting away," &c. This implies a spiritual benefit; and the remission of original sin with its consequences, is the only spiritual benefit of which many baptized persons are susceptible, *e.g.*, infants.

Works Printed and Published by W. E. Painter,
342, STRAND, LONDON.

On the First of January, April, July, and October,
**THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND QUARTERLY
REVIEW**

Complete sets, and back numbers may be had to perfect sets.

2.

On the First of every Month, price One Shilling, a New and Enlarged Series of

THE CHURCHMAN:

A Magazine in Support of the Church of England.

The Volumes of *The Churchman* for 1838, 1839, 1840, and June 1841, price
7s. 6d., cloth.

3.

Published on the First of each Month, price Twopence.

THE VILLAGE CHURCHMAN

ILLUSTRATED WITH ENGRAVINGS.

Volumes of *The Village Churchman* for 1838, 1839, and 1840, price 2s. 6d. cloth.

4.

Now ready, demy 12mo., cloth, a

**NEW EDITION OF ROMAN FALLACIES AND
CATHOLIC TRUTHS.**

Containing, Preface—Roman Tactics. Angel Worship; Saint Worship; Canonization of Saints; Worship of the Virgin Mary; Image Worship; Relic Worship; Adoration of the Cross; Adoration of the Host. Appendix—Answer to all Objections. Supplement—the Catholic the Old Religion, or the Fallacies of Pope Pius's Creed.

By the Rev. TOWNSEND POWELL, A.M., Vicar of Stretton-on-Dunsmore.

5.

Just published, in extra cloth boards, handsomely printed,

MARIOLATRY;

or, Facts and Evidences demonstrating the Worship of the Blessed Virgin Mary by the Church of Rome, derived from the testimonies of her Saints and Doctors, and from her Breviary, and other authorized books of devotion.

Second edition, corrected, with additions.

6.

Now publishing,

TRACTS OF THE ANGLICAN FATHERS.

Vol. I., ON THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER,]

contains Parts I. to V. Price 9s. cloth.

Vol. II., consisting of TRACTS ON DOCTRINE.

contains Parts VI. to XI. Price 9s. cloth.

Vol. III., will consist of TRACTS ON DISCIPLINE.

Vol. IV. will consist of PRACTICAL TRACTS.

Each Volume will be complete in itself, and may be had separate.

These Tracts will form a Series of literal Reprints of such shorter Treatises of Standard Divines of the Church of England as illustrate her distinguished principles, and are not now easily accessible in a cheap form.

7.

In one vol., cloth, price 8s.

PARLIAMENTARY SPEECHES.

SESSION 1840.

8.

REMARKS ON EVANGELICAL PREACHING

(exclusively so called).

as exhibited in a Published Sermon of the Rev. Henry Melvill.

By a LAYMAN. Price 6d.

9.

Also, by the same Author, price 8d.,

ORTHODOX PREACHING

(in contradistinction so called),

defended against Modern Objections and Misrepresentations.

10.

REVIEW OF RANKE'S HISTORY OF THE
POPES.From *The Church of England Quarterly Review*. 8vo. 1s.

11.

Now ready, 12mo. cloth, 6s.,

THOUGHTS ON THE LITANY

Edited by the Rev. GEORGE HEATON, M.A.

12.

Now publishing, price 1s.,

THE GOOD PARSON;

or, The Person of a Town, 1370. His Character from Chaucer. Imitated and Enlarged by Mr. Dryden: now again altered and abridged. Together with the Person's Prologue and Tale. By a Person of a Town, 1841.

13.

FIFTH THOUSAND,

With new and complete Index to each Volume, in two vols., cloth, embossed with the Huntingdon Arms, price 24s.,

THE LIFE AND TIMES OF

SELINA COUNTESS OF HUNTINGDON,

WITH A HIGHLY-FINISHED PORTRAIT.

The Materials for this Work, which have occupied in their collection and arrangement a period of upwards of twenty years, are supplied by

A Member of the Noble Families of Hastings and Ferrers.

14.

THE HISTORY OF ENGLAND

In Amusing Conversations between a Mother and her Daughter.

With a fine Engraving of Her Majesty the Queen.

By ANNE WOOTON.

15.

LIFE AND TIMES OF THOMAS A BECKET.

Demy 8vo., stitched. Price 1s. 6d.

16.

Now ready, price 4d.,

COLONIAL BISHOPRICS.

Speeches of the Archbishop of Canterbury, Bishop of London, Mr. Justice Coleridge, Mr. Labouchere, and Mr. W. E. Gladstone, at Willis's Rooms, on Tuesday, April 27, 1841.

